B
P314.Ti Yb

Tírechán's Memoir of St. Patrick

THE scope of this paper is restricted to Tírechán's work,[1] and no conclusions are drawn in regard to disputed questions connected with St. Patrick's life. Those questions cannot be satisfactorily discussed until the material with which the investigation has to deal has been methodically examined. Such an examination must proceed on the preliminary assumption that the documents are what they profess to be; it is only if they fail to stand the test of analysis that their origin becomes an open question. Perhaps it ought to be superfluous to add that the fact of Patrick's existence is inexpugnable until the 'Confession' has been proved spurious, and all attempts to shake its authenticity have signally failed.

1. Bishop Tírechán[2] was an alumnus or disciple of Ultan of Ardbraccan, bishop of the Dal-Conchobar. He put together his work on the life and acts of Patrick after the death of Ultan,[3] and Ultan died A.D. 657.[4] We can, however, assign, with probability,

[1] The work of B. Robert, *Etude Critique sur la Vie et l'Œuvre de Saint Patrick*, 1883, deals slightly with Tírechán. I have not found it helpful; nor have I gained light on the subject from the slight remarks in Skene's *Celtic Scotland*, ii. 427 *sqq*. I have used the manuscript of Armagh in studying the Patrician documents contained in it; and Dr. Gwynn, whose complete 'diplomatic' edition will soon appear, has been good enough to let me use his proof sheets. There is much to be done for the critical study of the *text* of these documents. Here is an example. In Muirchu (p. 273_{24}, ed. Stokes) we read: 'Loiguire nomine filius Neill, origo stirpis regiae huius pene insolae.' No editor seems to have stumbled; but the stupidest writer would not describe Ireland as a peninsula. The correction is obvious, 'huius pene totius insolae' (cp. 'pene totam insolam,' Tírechán, p. 312_4). All the existing editions are very inaccurate. I refer, for the sake of convenience, to the edition by Dr. W. Stokes in the Rolls series (*Tripartite Life of St. Patrick*, 1887), which I cite as 'Trip.'

[2] See the lemma to his memoir cited below in § 2. There seems to be no record of him independent of the Armagh manuscript.

[3] *Trip.* p. 311_{29}.

[4] See 'Annals of Tigernach' (ed. Stokes, in *Revue Celtique*, xvii. 1896, p. 194) = *Annals of Ulster* (Rolls series), under the year corresponding to A.D. 657. [In referring to dates in the *Annals of Ulster* (*Ann. Ult.*) after A.D. 486 it saves trouble to cite the true A.D.—the A.D. which was really meant. The cause of the antedating by one year (down to 1013 A.D.) in these annals was the numbering of the blank year 486 as 487, so that the misdating begins at 486. This, obviously the true solution, was first pointed out by Dr. MacCarthy in his Introduction to the Rolls ed., vol. iv.] Cp. also *Martyrolog. Dungallense*, ed. Todd, sub 4 Sept.

374252

a slightly later limit. The recent plague (*mortalitates novissimae*) which the writer mentions is most naturally identified with the Yellow Pestilence which devastated Ireland, according to the Annals, in A.D. 664.[5] If the date is right—and there seems no reason to question it—Tírechán wrote, or was engaged in writing, his work after A.D. 664. We shall probably not be far astray in regarding it as having been compiled in the sixties or seventies of the seventh century.

2. Tírechán's work has no title. The scribe, who before the middle of the ninth century[6] copied it into the 'Codex Armachanus,' introduced it with the explanatory statement—

Tírechán episcopus haec scripsit ex ore vel libro Ultani episcopi cuius ipse alumpnus vel discipulus fuit.

The wording shows that this is a lemma of the copyist and not due to Tírechán, who writes in the first person.

The work is not a regular biography, like Muirchu's, and its abrupt opening contrasts with Muirchu's elaborate introduction. It may rather be described as a collection of memoranda concerning the missionary acts of the saint in Ireland, and, though a brief summary of his early life is prefixed, nothing is said of his death. We shall see that the work was never completed.

It is divided, in the manuscript, into two books. Book i. begins with a concise account of the origin of Patrick and the chief events of the pre-episcopal period of his life. This is only a preliminary introduction. The book really opens with his journey along the coast of Meath, after which there is inserted a list of bishops and presbyters whom he ordained. Then follow an enumeration of churches which he founded in Bregia; an account of his triumph over Loegaire's magicians; other events in Meath; the meeting with the sons of Amolngid; the setting forth on a journey to the west. This journey is described as far as the Shannon.

Book ii. relates the continuation of St. Patrick's journey, in Connaught, and all he did there, and also describes how he travelled through Ulaidh till, *finito circulo*,[7] he returned to Meath. The book closes with an excursion to Leinster and a visit to Cashel.

The question whether the division into two books was made by

[5] *Trip.* p. 314_{28}; *Ann. Ult.* sub a. 664 (date confirmed by the eclipse of 1 May in the same year; cp. Bede, *H. E.* iii. 27). The pestilence continued during the following years (cp. *sub* 665, 667, 668). Tírechán's 'novissimas' seems to distinguish this plague from the visitations of the previous century, which were not long subsequent to the great pestilence that devastated southern Europe, A.D. 542 (*Ann. Ult.* sub 549, 556). Perhaps this earlier mortality is meant in p. 306_3.

[6] After 807 A.D. and before 846 A.D., the year of the scribe Ferdomnach's death (*Ann. Ult.* sub a.) See Graves, *Proceedings R. Irish Acad.* iii. 316 *sqq.*; Stokes, *Trip.* i. xc–i.

[7] *Trip.* p. 330_{26}.

Tírechán himself must be postponed to a later stage of the investigation.[8]

3. The end of Tírechán's memoranda is not expressly indicated in the manuscript, and before proceeding further we must fix the point of termination.

The common assumption seems to be that it ends at the words *adunata atque collecta sunt*,[9] immediately before the so-called 'Additions to Tírechán's Collections.' But this assumption can be disproved. The preceding paragraph, beginning *Finit hoc breviarium*,[10] cannot be Tírechán's summary of his own work, for his work does not contain any notice of Patrick's *gens*, or *genelogia*, or *two* captivities.[11] The index does not correspond to Tírechán's work. To what then is it an index? Clearly to the whole foregoing portion of the manuscript, including both Muirchu and Tírechán. The *gens*, the *genelogia*, the two captivities are in Muirchu.

It follows that, in order to determine where Tírechán's work stops, we must have recourse to internal evidence—the *apparent* external evidence being fallacious. Now the chronological table of Patrick's life [12] is inconsistent with Tírechán's statements at the beginning of his work,[13] and therefore we are justified in inferring that this table does not belong to his book. This is confirmed, perhaps, by an external indication: the insertion of the name *Dairenne* in a darker ink and different script [14] just before the chronological table indicates a break, though the meaning of the insertion is obscure.

The only question that remains is whether the statement of the three petitions of Patrick [15] belongs to Tírechán's work or not. The answer can hardly be doubtful. It seems, on any supposition, incredible that Tírechán should suddenly break off his record of journeys, church foundations, and conversions, and, without a word about Patrick's death, wind up his memoir with the three petitions. The probabilities of the case point irresistibly to the conclusion that Tírechán left his memoranda of Patrick's ecclesiastical activity unfinished, and that the last record he set down was the baptism of the sons of Nia Friuch *super petram Coithrigi hi Caissiul.*

Having been led to this conclusion by the arguments which I have stated, I turned to the manuscript, and there found an external confirmation. There is an interspace of two lines in fol. 15 v. B between

[8] See below, § 13. [9] *Trip.* p. 333_{24}. [10] *Ibid.* p. 333_{15-22}.
[11] Ll. 16, 18, 20. [12] *Trip.* p. 331_{21-27}. [13] *Ibid.* p. 302_{19-25}.
[14] The same ink and script reappear (Dr. Gwynn points out to me) in a marginal note (*ymnus colmán alo*) on f. 16 r. A, and in the text of f. 18 v. B; and the whole of f. 19 r. is written in this fashion. For reasons which need not be given here Dr. Gwynn is inclined to think that these portions were additions made not by another scribe, but by Ferdomnach himself.
[15] *Trip.* p. 331_{10-20}.

the paragraph ending *hi Caissiul* and that beginning *Hae sunt.*[16] There is no such mark of division throughout the whole text of Tírechán, which runs on continuously without any interspaces—not even between books i. and ii.

4. The general scheme of Tírechán's unfinished memoranda was geographical. Patrick's acts are arranged in the framework of a long circular journey through Meath, Connaught, and Ulster. At the end, after his return to Meath, is recorded his going into Leinster and Munster, but the memoranda deal mainly with his doings in Meath and Connaught.

Tírechán addressed his book to men in Meath,[17] and he speaks of the acts of Patrick, which he describes in book i. as well known to them. Unfortunately he does not tell us who these men were; but he alleges a particular motive for his own interest in Patrick, and seems to imply that it partly impelled him to compose his memoranda. He complains that 'deserters and *archicloci* and *milites Hiberniae*' hate Patrick, having taken away from him what was his, and are afraid that if Patrick's heir were to seek his Paruchia he could claim almost the whole island, 'for God gave him the whole island, with the men thereof.'[18] This is an important passage, and will claim particular attention presently. We might infer from it that Tírechán and his community belonged to the Paruchia of Patrick, but elsewhere there is a clear indication that this was the case.[19]

There are some other personal references in Tírechán. He had visited ruined Tara, for he saw with his own eyes[20] the stone on which Lochlethan was said to have been dashed to pieces—perhaps the old phallic stone which we see there to-day. He had visited Armagh and several places in Connaught, as we shall subsequently learn. Moreover he refers to his personal relations to Bishop Ultan, and this brings us to the question of his sources.

5. *Sources: Written.*—A. *Sources explicitly mentioned.*—The only written sources to which Tírechán refers are a book which belonged to Bishop Ultan and the 'Confession' of St. Patrick. Bishop Ultan's book[21] was a collection of 'Acta' based partly upon the 'Confession,' and was the source of Tírechán for his preliminary sketch of Patrick's early life. In drawing up this sketch

[16] The gap at this point in the manuscript is reproduced in Dr. Gwynn's forthcoming edition. It is to be observed that there are similar gaps after 'in die iudicii' (p. 332_{18}) and after 'in honore' (p. 333_{14}). It may be conjectured that these paragraphs were notes entered (in the course of the eighth century) in the manuscript from which Ferdomnach copied the Memoir of Tírechán, but clearly distinguished from that work.

[17] 'In vestris regionibus,' *Trip.* p. 311_{27}.

[18] *Ibid.* pp. 311_{30}–312_{6}.

[19] *Ibid.* p. 309_{31}. See below, § 9.

[20] *Ibid.* p. 307_{7}

[21] *Ibid.* p. 302_{3}.

Tírechán, it is tolerably clear, had before him only this book of 'Acta,' and did not consult the 'Confession,' although he refers to it as the saint's own *commemoratio laborum*.[22] In another place[23] he quotes Patrick's statement[24] that he gave money presents to tribal chiefs to secure a safe passage in the districts which he was in the habit of visiting. We have no indication whether Tírechán, when he wrote this, had the 'Confession' before him or quoted it at secondhand.

B. *Chronological Notices.*—At the end of the introduction, immediately after the statements derived from Bishop Ultan's book, Tírechán has inserted a chronological notice as to the dates of Patrick's death and Loegaire's reign.[25] This notice was evidently derived from a written source, as Todd rightly inferred[26] from the author's doubt as to whether a numeral was *ii* or *u*. The most obvious conjecture is that the document which supplied Tírechán with this chronological record was the same book, belonging to Bishop Ultan, from which he had drawn the preceding sketch of Patrick's early life.[27] But this is only a conjecture, and may be quite wrong.

In connexion with this chronological notice, although it is not my intention to discuss any question of fact concerning Patrick's life, it is within my scope to determine what year Tírechán assigns as the date of the saint's death. The manuscript gives: '*a passione hautem Christi colleguntur anni* cccc xxx ui.' This date might mean four distinct years according to the Passion era presumed. It might mean A.D. (1) 463 (*ann. Pass.* = 28, Victorian reckoning); (2) 464 (*ann. Pass.* = 29); (3) 467 (*ann. Pass.* = 32); (4) 468 (*ann. Pass.* = 33[28]). Now it may be shown that none of these years can have been intended by Tírechán or his source.

For Tírechán states that King Loegaire survived Patrick *duobus uel* u *annis*. Consequently Loegaire's death would have to fall A.D. (1) *a*, 465, or *b*, 468; or (2) *a*, 466, or *b*, 469; or (3) *a*, 469, or *b*, 472; or (4) *a*, 470, or *b*, 473.

But, on the other hand, he likewise states that King Loegaire reigned 36 years (that is, 35 years + *x* months), a statement which agrees perfectly with the chronology of the Annals. Loegaire came

[22] I have shown elsewhere that this need not be interpreted of some lost work of Patrick. See the *Guardian*, 27 Nov. 1901.

[23] *Trip.* p. 310_5.

[24] 'Confession,' *ibid.* p. 372_{31-4}.

[25] *Trip.* p. 302_{27} *sqq.*

[26] Todd, *St. Patrick*, p. 395, n. 1.

[27] Zimmer thinks that this sketch was originally contained in Patrick's *Confession*, assuming that our text of that document as contained in the fuller manuscripts is imperfect ('Keltische Kirche,' in Hauck's *Realencyklopädie f. protestantische Theologie u. Kirche*, x. 220). This is only a guess, and I cannot think it probable. Zimmer does not indeed suggest that the 'liber apud Ultanum' was the *Confession* itself, only 'dass Ultan eine vollständige Hs. der *Confessio* gekannt hat.'

[28] Todd curiously assumed this era without discussion as a matter of course, and then reduced the date falsely to 469 A.D. (*op. cit.* p. 395).

to the throne in 428–9 A.D.,[29] was killed in 463 A.D.;[30] Oilill Molt succeeded him in 463 A.D.,[31] reigned twenty years,[32] and was slain at the battle of Ocha in 482 A.D. There is no doubt that this was the authentic tradition of the Annals.

Here I must make a short digression. It has been shown (in my judgment convincingly) by Dr. MacCarthy that the form to which all the existing Irish annals ultimately go back was derived from Paschal tables.[33] The Paschal data were omitted as irrelevant; but the final and the lunar incidence of 1 Jan. were employed to distinguish the years. Into such a framework the old annalists (not to be confounded with later compilers, like Tigernach) endeavoured to fit foreign dates derived from foreign chronicles, such as Marcellinus, Isidore, and Bede; and they frequently went wrong in the process of equating the consular years with their own years, marked by moons and week days. But they had also to date and synchronise the events of their native land; and the question arises, what material or what landmarks were at their disposal for arranging those events? No certain answer can be given; but it seems probable that, before the synchronising process began, profane events were dated by the years of the kings of Ireland. In any case there can be no doubt that there was a definite—and

[29] 'Annals of Inisfallen' (in *Rer. Hib. Script.* vol. ii.), the first entry; A.M. (Victorian) 5630 = A.M. ('Hebrew') 4381 (*sic legendum*, as Dr. MacCarthy has shown) = A.D. 429. See MacCarthy, *op. cit. infra*, p. 363. The date is confirmed by the equation A.D. 432 = fourth year of Loegaire, in the third entry of the same Annals.

[30] *Ann. Ult.* sub a. 462, and in *Ann. Inisf.* the same entry, wrongly equated by the editor with 464 A.D.

[31] *Ann. Ult.* sub a., and in *Ann. Inisf.* (wrongly equated with 465 A.D.)

[32] Compare the tract (date, second half of twelfth century) published by Dr. MacCarthy from the *Book of Ballymote* (p. 48 b) in his Todd Lecture IV. on the *Codex Palatino-Vaticanus* 830, p. 396: 'Ailill molt mac Nathi [*i.e.* n-Dathi] fiche bliadhan' (= twenty years). In the same place there is an entry about Loegaire's reign which deserves attention, because it helps to expose an argument which Todd adduced in support of his unconvincing reconstruction of Patrician chronology. The entry is, 'Laegaire macNeill triginta annis regnum Hiberniae post adventum Patricii tenuit.' This disposes of Todd's explanation of the parallel passage in the 'Book of Lecan' (Todd, *op. cit.* p. 397), which he interpreted to mean that the whole duration of Loegaire's reign was thirty years. It may be suspected that Todd himself was not quite happy about his argument, as it is disproved by a notice in the tract on the 'Reigns and Times of Ireland after the Faith,' in the 'Book of Leinster,' which he cites (p. 184) and is unable to explain away except by an assertion (p. 398, n. 2). In quoting the entry he omits the date, which will be found in Stokes's edition of the tract, in *Trip.* p. 512: '[A.M.] iiii m. ccc. lxxx iiii,' which is A.D. 432. This, combined with the date given for Oilill Molt's accession (A.D. 463), shows that the compiler of the tract meant what he said. Todd's criticism in the same connexion on the chronology in Gilla Coemáin's poem is from the purpose, as has been shown by Dr. MacCarthy.

[33] Dr. MacCarthy's investigations, which seem to me to be 'grundlegend,' have been published in the *Todd Lectures* (cited in preceding note) and in the introduction to the *Annals of Ulster*, vol. iv. (Rolls series). His view that historical entries were made (at the time) in actual Paschal tables is plausible and possibly right, but is not proved.

probably, for some time back, perfectly correct—record of the number of regnal years of the kings. Such records could be preserved by memory; it does not matter, for our present purpose, whether they were committed to writing or not before Christian literati began the work of synchronising. It is clear that the most meagre chronicle of this kind would involve the dates of certain events—such as that of a battle in which an *árd-rí* was slain. The regnal years would doubtless have been remembered in round numbers; a king, for example, who died after his 29th year was completed would be remembered as having reigned 30 years. Now the synchronisers adopted the convention of recording the death of a king or pope in one year and the accession of his successor in the next. Hence, when it is recorded that Loegaire succeeded Dathi in 429 A.D., and died in 462 A.D., we have to determine whether the first regnal change occurred in 429 or in 428, and whether the second occurred in 462 or in 463. The circumstance that the regnal years of Loegaire's are handed down as 36, and those of Oilill Molt as 20, decides for the dates A.D. 428 and 463.

Now the dating of the battle of Ocha in the 'Ultonian Annals' throws an interesting light on this subject. Two dates are given: 482 A.D. and 483 A.D. The first date was recognised by that annalistic tradition, which was the main ultimate source of the compilation, as is proved (1) by the appearance of the entry (in a mutilated form) under the corresponding year in the 'Annals of Inisfallen,' and (2) by the fact that the entry is made in categorical form, while the entry under 483 A.D. is (*a*) qualified by *vel in hoc anno secundum alios*, (*b*) is in Irish, *cath Ocha* instead of *bellum Oche*, (*c*) does not mention the death of Oilill. The second date, therefore, was drawn from another source. Now it might be argued that this second date deserves the preference, on the following ground: If Oilill Molt was slain in 482 A.D. we should expect to find the accession of his successor Lugaid entered under the next year, 483 A.D., in accordance with the conventional practice of the Annals; and then we should expect to find it repeated (with *secundum alios* or a similar formula) under 484 A.D., to suit the alternative dating of the battle of Ocha; whereas we find Lugaid's accession recorded only under 484 A.D. and without any expression of doubt. Therefore it might be said: Lugaid's conventional accession year being 484 A.D., his actual accession and his predecessor's death must have fallen in 483 A.D.

Such reasoning would miss the point. The circumstance that the Annals set Oilill Molt's death in 482 A.D. and Lugaid's accession in 484 A.D. is historically significant. It proves that there was an interregnum of more than a year after the battle of Ocha before Lugaid was recognised as over-king. This is the true inference, and it explains at once the double dating of the battle. For

Lugaid's accession being fixed to 484 A.D., the chronological presumption might seem to be that his predecessor must have died in 483 A.D.

Exactly the same thing happened in regard to this king Lugaid's death. He died in 508 A.D.; there was an interregnum of five years; and Muirchertach became king of Ireland in 513 A.D. That was the genuine tradition. But some hasty chronologist seeing Muirchertach's accession in 513 A.D., inferred that Lugaid's death must have fallen in 512 A.D.; and this alternative date is quoted in the 'Ultonian Annals' from a mysterious source called the 'Liber Monachorum.'

I have made this digression for the purpose of illustrating what seems to be an assured fact, that the Christian chronologists of the sixth and seventh centuries had to do with a perfectly definite—and there is no reason why we should not suppose a perfectly authentic—tradition as to the regnal years of the Irish kings. Now it is highly improbable that Tírechán had any other tradition before him,[34] or that his source agreed with the annalistic tradition in

[34] Another date for the accession of Loegaire is suggested (not stated) in the Annals of Ultonia and Inisfallen, but manifestly rests on a mere mistake. The death of King Dathi, who preceded Loegaire, is entered under A.D. 445 in the 'Ultonian Annals,' and (in a mutilated form) in the 'Annals of Inisfallen.' The former entry is in Irish with the addition in Latin, 'et obiit xx^a [*sic*] tribus annis regnavit in Hibernia,' which exactly corresponds with the traditional limits of his reign—A.D. 405 (? 406)–428 = twenty-three years. We may conclude that this entry has crept in here simply by accident—an accident which must have happened to the common source of the two chronicles, and for which neither the Inisfallen nor the Ultonian compiler is responsible. The original entry (expanded in *Ann. Ult.*) was doubtless in Latin, 'Dathi obiit et xxiii annis regnavit in Hibernia,' and was meant to appear under the year corresponding to A.D. 428. Now if in a list of years distinguished by lunar incidence this entry had been inserted under the year *lun.* uii (= A.D. 426), instead of under *lun.* xxiiii (= A.D. 428), it is conceivable that it might have been inadvertently inserted, in the course of compilation, under *lun.* uii of the following decemnovennal cycle (= A.D. 445). I suggest this as a possible source of the mistake.

In connexion with Loegaire I must point out another error which might mislead. There is a statement in *Ann. Ult.* (under A.D. 432) that Patrick arrived in the thirteenth (xii is clearly an error for xiii) or in the fourteenth year of Loegaire, and the editor suggests that this may be taken seriously as a possibly authentic tradition assigning Patrick's arrival in Ireland to A.D. 443. He quotes the corresponding passage in the 'Annals of Inisfallen.' But this passage should have saved him from drawing such a deduction. The statement there (at least according to O'Conor's text: a necessary reserve) is that Patrick arrived in the thirteenth or fourteenth year, not of Loegaire, *but of Theodosius.* Here is the text: 'Palladius vero hic uno anno mansit xiimo anno Teothosii minoris, Patricius vero xiiio vel ut alii dicunt xivto anno eiusdem venit ad Scotos Patricius quo Palladius ad Romam rediit,' &c. (the text after 'venit' is corrupt—perhaps '[venit;] venit ad Scotos Patricius [anno] quo,' &c.) It is evident from this that the statement in the 'Ultonian Annals' was due to a misunderstanding, and does not represent a divergent tradition as to Patrick's coming. How the mistake as to the years of Theodosius occurred does not, in itself, much matter, but it is not difficult to discover. 433 A.D. was the consular year 'Theodosii xiiii et Maximi:' so it was distinguished in the chronicle of Marcellinus, which was largely used by the Irish synchronisers. xiiii was mistaken for the *regnal* year of

regard to the regnal years of Loegaire and disagreed with it as to the regnal years of Oilill Molt. Tírechán's date for the death of Patrick involves, as we have seen, dates for Loegaire's death varying from 464 to 473 A.D., all of which necessitate lesser or greater curtailments of the reign of Oilill Molt. The inference is that the date which the text of Tírechán presents for St. Patrick's death is inaccurate.

On this supposition we find a perfectly simple solution. The same palaeographical source of error which caused Tírechán's doubt whether Loegaire survived Patrick by two or only five years—namely, the confusion of the numerals ii and u—has produced a corruption in the date assigned for Patrick's death. Both iu and iii ran the risk of being taken for ui. Thus in the present case ccccxxxui might have been a misreading of either ccccxxxiii or ccccxxxiu. And either of these readings would give us a date consistent with the rest of the passage. (1) *Ann. Pass.* 433 means A.D. 461, reckoned on the A.D. 29 era, while (2) *ann. Pass.* 434 gives A.D. 461 on the Victorian system. Either number therefore might accord with the statement that Loegaire survived Patrick by two years.

Now there is an external consideration of sufficient weight to lead us to decide for the first emendation: ccccxxxiii. In the Armagh MS. the numbers 4 and 9 are denoted not by iu and ix but by iiii and uiiii. The presumption is that the same notation was used in the manuscripts from which it was copied. This consideration weighs against the emendation ccccxxxiu.

Our conclusion agrees with the entry in the 'Ultonian Annals' under A.D. 461: 'Hic alii quietem Patrici dicunt.'[35] We are justified in assuming that the same year was intended by Tírechán, and that the *ann. Pass.* 433, which we have restored to his text, was calculated on the A.D. 29 era.

Now there is an important entry in the 'Annals of Inisfallen'

Theodosius, and then A.D. 432 and 431 were equated with his regnal years xiii and xii. Thus the point of the entry is no more than this: Some people held the opinion that Patrick's coming should be placed not in A.D. 432 but in A.D. 433.

[35] It must be insisted that this date is an alternative to the A.D. 493 date. It has been sometimes referred to (for instance in Mr. Olden's *History of the Church of Ireland*) as if it were an alternative to the entry under A.D. 457, 'Quies senis Patricii' (cp. *Chron. Scot.* under the same year). This is an unwarranted assumption. That portion of Mr. Olden's book relating to Patrick—the only part I have glanced at—is distinguished by slipshod quotations and references at secondhand. As an illustration of the manner in which unfounded opinions are adopted and exaggerated by uncritical writers, it is worth noticing that Mr. Olden states categorically (p. 30) that Patrick's death 'took place in A.D. 463,' for which assertion his only authority is the opinion of Dr. W. Stokes (*Trip.* intr., p. cxliii) that the saint died 'probably in or about the year 463'—confessedly a mere opinion, unsupported by historical proofs.

placing Patrick's death *anno* ccccxxxii *a passione Domini*.[36] It is incongruously inserted under the year corresponding to A.D. 493, in which, according to the standard annalistic tradition, Patrick died; and this very incongruity, without any indication that the compiler was conscious of it, tells a tale. The date has to be corrected, by the addition of one stroke, to ccccxxxiii. In the 'Annals of Ulster' this date was rightly equated with A.D. 461 and entered under that year as an alternative to the dating A.D. 493, while in the 'Annals of Inisfallen' it was simply inserted, without any note of inconsistency, under the latter year.

It seems obvious that the A.P. date of Patrick's death in Tírechán, the A.P. date in the southern chronicle, and the A.D. 461 date in the northern chronicle represent one original datum. Now in the annalistic tradition which forms the framework of the Annals the obituary year of the saint was A.D. 493. This is the date which the compiler of the Inisfallen and the compiler of the Ultonian Annals and Tigernach[37] alike found in the framework on which they constructed their compilations. This is shown by the agreement of the recensions and also by the fact that, while the Ultonian Annalist gives the date A.D. 493 categorically, he gives the date A.D. 461 with the qualification *hic alii dicunt*. On the other hand Tírechán, our earliest source, gives the A.D. 461 date, without any alternative or any expression of doubt. We may infer that the chronological framework which is the basis of the early post-Christian portion of our existing Annals had not been fully constructed, or assumed its final form, or been generally accepted in the second half of the seventh century.

But before that time learned men had been engaged in arranging the chronology of Irish history. This fact is disclosed in another chronological notice (in book ii.) which must now be considered.[38] Tírechán appeals to the authority of *peritissimi numerorum*, 'technical chronologists,'[39] for the date which he assigns for the birth of

[36] Under the year equated by O'Conor with A.D. 488. Collation with the *Ann. Ult.* shows the years that are really meant in the corrupt manuscript of the 'Inisfallen Annals.' The years A.D. 429–455 have been rightly equated by Dr. MacCarthy (*Cod. Pal.-Vat.* 830, p. 352 *sqq.*)

[37] See the entry in ed. Stokes, *Rev. Celt.* xvii. 122. The year corresponds to A.D. 493.

[38] *Trip.* p. 318_{17} (very inaccurately printed). The text should run: 'Interest autem inter mortem Patricii et [Ciar]ani natiuitatem, [ut] peritissimi numerorum aestimant, CXL [an]norum, et baptizatus est Ceranus a [pue]ro Patricii a diacono Iusto <in> pop[uli] conspectu.' The reading 'populi,' which makes good sense, is the result of Dr. Gwynn's careful examination of the traces in the manuscript, and there is no doubt about it. The number is indistinct, but the CX is legible, and CXL is borne out by the derivative passage in the *Tripartite Life* (p. 104_{29}), though the writer of that passage misunderstood his source and took 140 to be the age of Justus.

[39] The Irish in the sixth century prided themselves on their skill in Paschal calculations; cp. Columbanus, Letter to Pope Gregory (Migne, *P. L.* lxxx. 261).

St. Ciarán, the carpenter's son. At a first glance it would seem possible that his information here was oral, that he personally consulted experts with whom he was acquainted. But an examination of the notice itself will decide us to conclude that his source was a written document.

According to this notice 140 years elapsed between the death of Patrick and the birth of Ciarán. This is obviously false. St. Ciarán belongs to the first half of the sixth century; his death is assigned to A.D. 549. The date which Tírechán assigns would make him a contemporary of Ultan and an elder contemporary of Tírechán himself. There is, therefore, an error. It might occur to one that cxl is a textual mistake for xl. Since Tírechán's date for Patrick's death is, as we have seen, A.D. 461, an interval of 40 years would place Ciarán's birth in A.D. 501—a date which is physically possible. If there were any record alleging this date we might consider the suggested emendation highly probable; but, as the records which exist point to other dates, it would be only a useless guess, for which nothing could be said.

In the 'Ultonian Annals' three dates *appear* to be assigned for St. Ciarán's birth—A.D. 512, 517, and 516. The first two dates are given under the respective years; the third is indicated under A.D. 549 (the year of his death) by the statement that he died in the thirty-fourth year of his age, which implies that he was born in A.D. 516. There can, however, be no doubt that the second and third dates really represent the same tradition, A.D. 517, the discrepancy being due to a numerical error.[40] Now if Tírechán's chronological authority approved of the date A.D. 512 the interval from Patrick's death to Ciarán's birth would have been assigned as 51 years. If, on the other hand, A.D. 517 was adopted the interval would have been 56 years. This puts the solution in our hands—140-56=84. In other words the chronologists, to whom Tírechán refers, operated with the Paschal 84 cycle[41] which was employed in Ireland before the conciliation with Roman usage—and in their copy of the chronological table which Tírechán (or his authority) consulted a whole cycle had been accidentally skipped in entering Ciarán's birth. The 56th and 140th years (reckoned exclusively) after Patrick's death were each the 53rd year in an 84 cycle.[42]

Thus the text of the Armagh MS. is sound, and the error was due to an inadvertency in Tírechán's chronological source.[43]

[40] xxxiii (Ciarán's age) may have been misread as xxxiu.

[41] That is, they distinguished each year by its cyclic number in the 84 cycle.

[42] See Dr. MacCarthy's table N (*Annals of Ulster*, vol. iv.) He has shown that the initial year of the 84 cycle was A.D. 381, and has calculated fully the Paschal table. I ought to say that but for his Paschal investigations the solution of the Ciarán passage would hardly have occurred to me.

[43] Of course it is also possible that Tírechán himself was the culprit, and that in counting the interval of years between the two entries he added a whole cycle unwittingly.

The inadvertency is fortunate, for it gives us a glimpse behind the scene.

It follows that the date of Ciarán's birth, according to the chronological specialists who enjoyed credit in the seventh century, was A.D. 517; and that according to the same authorities the date of Patrick's death was A.D. 461. We might now be inclined to conjecture that the other dates of Tírechán, as to Loegaire's reign and Patrick's death, were derived not from Ultan's book but from the same document in which he found Ciarán's birth, or else that the notice of Ciarán's birth was in Ultan's book. But we must not try to know too much.

In illustration of the foregoing criticism of the chronological passages in Tírechán it is appropriate to point out here the import of a passage in the 'Historia Brittonum.' This passage [44] supplies its own date—A.D. 858—and furnishes three dates for St. Patrick.

1°. a nativitate domini usque ad adventum Patricii ad Scottos ccccv anni sunt.

2°. viginti tres cycli decemnovennales ab incarnatione domini usque ad adventum Patricii in Hiberniam et ipsi annos efficiunt numero ccccxxxviii.

3°. a morte Patricii usque ad obitum sanctae Brigidae sexaginta anni.

The first and second of these statements are inconsistent with each other. It has indeed been supposed that they refer to two distinct advents—the second to the chief advent of which the traditional date is A.D. 432, and the first to some earlier visit.[45] But this is not a permissible explanation. For the writer is not concerned here with Patrick's biography; he is concerned only with leading epochs, such as *the* coming of Patrick, and it is impossible to suppose that he would mention in this context, as an epoch, the date of a minor event, such as Patrick's captivity (the only earlier visit for which there is evidence). It is perfectly clear that the *adventus Patricii* in 1° is the same as the *adventus Patricii* in 2°. And the number ccccv is perfectly sound; it is the Passion date (on the Victorian reckoning) [46] corresponding to A.D. 432 (= 405 + 27). The error lies in *nativitate*, which is simply a slip of the pen for *passione*. We have not to seek far for an instance of this particular inadvertency; we find one in the Irish version of this very work.[47]

Thus 1° gives the received date A.D. 432 for the coming of

[44] Ed. Mommsen, pp. 158–9 (*Chron. Min.* vol. iii.)

[45] Mommsen seems tacitly to adopt this view (p. 117).

[46] The same Passion date occurs in the document (A) edited by Dr. MacCarthy from the 'Book of Ballymote' (see *supra*). The manuscript gives A.P. 401, 402 (= A.M. 5632, 5633 = A.D. 431, 432), which he has corrected to 404, 405.

[47] Ed. Mommsen, p. 172: 'Nennius, *anno cccxlvii post passionem Christi*; Nenn. interpretatus, *a nativitate Christi cccxlvii annos.*'

Patrick. But in 2° we find the same event dated A.D. 437 (=*Ann. Incarn.* 438, the first year of an Alexandrine decemnovennal cycle). It is obvious that the writer was unconscious of the incongruity, and thought that the two dates coincided. The explanation of his error is simple. The Passion year, 405, was his datum; and, being inexperienced in chronological systems and not knowing that it was calculated on the A.D. 28 era of Victorius, he proceeded to reduce it to an Incarnation year by adding 33. This gave him 438, which he recognised as the first year of a decemnovennal cycle. It is not unimportant to clear this up, for one is not yet quite sure that the spectre of Todd's Patrician chronology is laid.

In 3° the date of Patrick's death is not given. A.D. 493 is obviously out of the question. A.D. 457, which seems to be the obituary year of Patrick in the 'Annales Cambriae,' has been adduced as relevant;[48] but no date has been handed down for the death of St. Brigit which combined with A.D. 457 will give an interval of sixty years. We must fall back on A.D. 461, and perhaps the simplest explanation might seem to be that the date implied for St. Brigit's death was A.D. 521, which has the authority of the 'Annales Cambriae.' But there is a serious objection. The author of the passage under our consideration states that 'four' years elapsed between the birth of Columcille and the death of Brigit. But there is no authority for A.D. 517 as the date of Columcille's birth; and the fact that the 'Annales Cambriae' place both events in the same year, 521, shows that the author was not following a tradition preserved in that compilation.[49] If we consider that the date of Patrick's death might have been known to him in the form of a Passion year, 434 (Victorian), and would have been reduced, by the same process to which he submitted the advent date, to the Incarnation year 467=A.D. 466; and if we suppose that A.D. 526—one of the dates assigned for Brigit's death in the 'Ultonian Annals'[50]—was given to him not as a Passion year, but in another form, we

[48] Mommsen, p. 159, n. 1.

[49] It may be questioned whether the date for Brigit's death in the *Ann. Cambr.* represents an independent tradition. It is a suggestive fact that these annals give the date of St. Ciarán's death as (*ann.* 100=) A.D. 544, whereas the accepted date (as to which there is exceptional unanimity) in the Irish records is A.D. 549. It is much more likely in this case that there was a mistake of five years in the entry than that there was a different tradition. The Irish dates in the early portion of the Cambrian Annals ought not to be lightly invoked; it is more probable that some of them are misadjustments of dates calculated on different eras than that they represent a distinct tradition.

[50] The alternative dates 524 and 526 for Brigit's death (both given in *Ann. Ult.*) are probably due to the alternative dates 491 and 493 for Patrick's death. If, for instance, A.D. 524 was the actual year of her death it was noted that thirty-three years elapsed since Patrick's death in 491; then on the hypothesis that Patrick died in 493 it was argued back that Brigit died in 526. Or the process may have been the reverse.

can see how he counted exactly (526 — 466) sixty years between the two events.[51]

My purpose in discussing this passage is to show that the date A.P. 433 (=Victorian 434)=A.D. 461 was current in the ninth century as the year of St. Patrick's death.

C. *Tírechán and Muirchu: Common Sources.*—I have still to mention a passage in book ii. which may have been transcribed from an older document. It is the legend of Patrick breathing fire upon the son of Miliucc in the time of his captivity.[52] The circumstance that Patrick is here called Succetus suggests that this may be a transcription. And the suspicion is strengthened by the probability that the following passage, about the angel's footstep at Scirte and his command to Patrick, comes from a written source. One might indeed, at first sight, gather from an expression that Tírechán had himself visited Skerry. He says that the footstep of the angel *usque nunc* PENE *adest.* This sounds as if the alleged trace of the angel's foot had been pointed out to him and he had required an effort of faith to convince his eyes that it was visible. But the inference would be hasty. If it can be shown that Tírechán was here using a document we may be practically sure that the words *pene adest* are transcribed, and are not the record of his own personal impression. Now compare this passage with two passages in Muirchu's 'Life.'

TÍRECHÁN (p. 330_{15-19}).	MUIRCHU (p. 276_{11-14}).	MUIRCHU (p. 300_{10-13}).
(Et exiit ad Montem Scirte ad locum) *petrae* super quam vidit anguelum Domini stantem, et vestigium pedis illius usque nunc pene adest, cum ascendisset in caelum pedibus extensis de monte ad montem, dixitque: Ecce navis tua parata est; surge et ambula.	De quo monte multo ante . . . preso vestigio in *petra* alterius montis expedito gradu uidit anguelum Victoricum in conspectu eius ascendisse in caelum.	anguelus . . . pedem supra *petram* ponens in Scirit in [*sic*] montem Mis coram se ascendit; vestigia pedis angueli in *petra* huc usque manentia cernuntur.

[51] A.D. 526 is the fifth year after the date for Columcille's birth given by Tigernach (*Rev. Celt.* 1896, p. 128; kal. vii=), A.D. 522, and this might explain the author's 'quattuor anni.' If A.D. 523 (*Ann. Ult.*), which has more claim to be regarded as the true date of St. Columba's birth (since it satisfies the particular statement in Lebar Brec, 31 a, l. 49, that he was born on 7 Dec.=Thursday), were intended we should expect 'tres anni.' A.D. 523 is itself inconsistent with the recorded age (seventy-six years) of Columba at the time of his death, the year of his death being, as Dr. MacCarthy has shown, A.D. 596 (cp. *Cod. Pal.-Vat.* 830, p. 22); and the seventy-six years of the Annals is borne out by the statements in Adamnan's *Life* (cp. Reeves, *Adamnan*, p. lxix). This is not the place to discuss the vexed question of St.

It is clear that these three passages go back ultimately to an original written account; the use of *petra* is significant. But on the other hand it does not seem probable that Tírechán and Muirchu consulted copies of the same document. It is to be observed at least that, in regard to Miliucc, Muirchu seems to know nothing of Tírechán's story of Patrick breathing fire,[53] while Tírechán makes no reference to the death of Miliucc, recorded by Muirchu. The probable conclusion is that the document used by Tírechán (Ultan's book?) and the document used by Muirchu derived the record of the angel's footstep on the *petra* from a common original.

In this connexion it may be noticed that while Muirchu takes Patrick straight from Inbher Dea to Dalaradia—first to Saul and then to the scene of his captivity—Tírechán omits all mention of the visit to southern Dalaradia and transfers the visit to Scirte to a later stage.

There is another point at which Tírechán and Muirchu touch—the legend of the conflicts of Patrick with the magicians of Loegaire. Their versions of the incidents which caused the deaths of the two magicians correspond accurately; but they relate the incidents in different order, and they name the magicians differently. Muirchu calls the magician who was burnt to death in the ordeal Lucetmael (*alias* Ronal); the other, who was flung upwards into the air and dashed to pieces on the ground, he calls Lochru (*alias* Lothroch). Tírechán speaks of three magicians, but his text gives the names of only two—Cruth and Lochlethlanu. Of these Lochlethlanu corresponds to Lochru. He does not designate by name the other magician who was burnt in the *cassula* of Benignus; so that it remains uncertain whether he is to be identified with Cruth or the anonymous third. It is quite possible that *Lucet* has fallen out of the text between the other two names. But even if the two writers agreed in this name the other divergency is sufficient to show that Tírechán did not depend on the document used by Muirchu. It is also to be noticed that Muirchu places the destruction of Lochru on the night of Easter Eve, and the ordeal of Lucetmael on Easter Day, while Tírechán reverses the order of the incidents and does not distinguish the occasions.

Columba's birth-date, but it may be observed that the data could be reconciled by supposing that the true year is A.D. 520, and the birthday 7 Dec. = Monday, 'feria ii,' Thursday in the *Lebar Brec* arising from the common confusion of ii with u. On this hypothesis the entry of the event under 519 in *Ann. Ult.* may be merely a mistake, 520 being intended.

[52] 'Sed alia nocte—excelsi,' *Trip.* p. 330_{2-14}.

[53] Nor of his instructing Miliucc's son and daughters (Tírechán, pp. 329_{29}–330_{2}).

Observe how the two accounts of the former incident tally.

TÍRECHÁN (pp. 306_{25}–307_{5}).	MUIRCHU (p. 281_{7-16}).
et elevavit Patricius manus suas Deo circa magum Lochletheum[54] et dixit: *Domine mi, iece a me canem qui oblatrat faciem tuam* et me; *eat in mortem.* Et intenderunt[55] omnes *magum elevatum* per tenebras nocturnales *poene usque ad caelum,* sed *reversus*[56] cadaver illius congluttinatum grandinibus et nivibus commixtum scintillis igneis in terram *ante faciem omnium* cecidit. Et est *lapis* illius in oris australibus orientalibusque usque in praesentem diem et conspexi illum oculis meis.	hunc autem intuens turvo oculo talia promentem sanctus Patricius, ut quondam Petrus de Simone, cum quadam potentia et magno clamore confidenter ad Dominum dixit: *Domine,* qui omnia potes et in tua potestate consistunt quique me missisti huc, *hic impius qui blasfemat nomen tuum elevetur nunc foras et cito moriatur.* Et his dictis *elivatus est in aethera magus* et *iterum* dimissus foras *desuper verso ad lapidem* cerebro comminutus et mortuus fuerat *coram eis.*

These two accounts correspond closely. Tírechán's is the more vigorous and picturesque; he adds the touch that the body in its passage through the air became *conglutinatum grandinibus et nivibus* and *commixtum scintillis igneis.* Muirchu has clearly transformed the language of his source in accordance with his own ideas of style; instead of the vigorous *canem qui oblatrat* of Tírechán he gives the tame *impius qui blasphemat*; instead of the simple *ad caelum* he has *in aethera.* But both accounts go back to a common source, which is probably reproduced pretty closely in Tírechán. The proof that they do not represent independent versions of the legend is the fact that in both Patrick appeals to God in speeches not only of the same intent but closely similar in form.

It is worthy of note that Tírechán's abrupt *lapis illius* is not quite intelligible; or rather it would suggest a gravestone, if we had not Muirchu's version, which shows that it was the stone on which the body was dashed to pieces. We may infer that in his source there was a clause (which he omitted to transcribe) corresponding to Muirchu's *verso ad lapidem cerebro comminutus.* Another point to be observed is the implied note of time in *per tenebras nocturnales,* which shows that Tírechán's source agreed with the tradition of Muirchu, who placed the incident on the night of Easter Eve.

In general this comparison illustrates the difference between Muirchu the stylist and Tírechán, who was probably content, when

[54] Scribal error for 'Lochlethaneum.'

[55] 'Heard' (cp. Fr. 'entendre')—a graphic touch.

[56] Apparently adverbial, on analogy of the prepositions 'versus,' 'adversus.'

he used a written source, to reproduce it simply, or if he altered it, only to abbreviate it.[57]

6. *Sources: Oral.*—(1) In his *preliminary* sketch of St. Patrick's early life Tírechán derived one statement from the mouth of Bishop Ultan. 'Patrick was thirty years in the island which is called Aralanensis; *mihi testante Ultano episcopo.*' [58]

(2) As to *book i.*, the author professes that most of his story is well known to those whom he addresses in the land of the Húi Néill, but adds that he derived some useful information for it from many seniors and from Ultan.[59] One scrap of information that he obtained from 'seniors' he permits us to know. He gives the names of three brothers and their sister who were established by Patrick in a church which he founded at Vadum Molae (near Kells), on the authority of old men.[60]

(3) As to the sources of *book ii.*, the longest and most important part of the memoir, no indication is supplied.

7. A grave question therefore arises as to the authenticity of Tírechán's copious, though for the most part concise, memoranda concerning the acts of St. Patrick in the regions of Connaught. Now we must suppose one of two things. Either Tírechán copied from one or more written documents or else he collected the material (himself or by the help of another) from oral sources in Connaught. We may reject, at least provisionally, the former alternative. If Tírechán had used a *liber* enumerating the Connaught foundations and the proceedings of Patrick in that kingdom, the presumption is that he would have mentioned it or alluded to it; and it will appear hereafter that this consideration is weightier than it might seem to be at first sight. We will, accordingly, assume for the present that his sources were oral, as in book i.

Now his memoranda by no means resemble biographical 'Acta' which are written to glorify the memory of a saint and edify the faithful. Miracles and legendary anecdotes are introduced when occasion demands, but the miraculous is not prominent. Tírechán's work is virtually an enumeration of the ecclesiastical foundations of Patrick, with a description of the circumstances in which each was

[57] The story of the ordeal of fire, to which Lucetmael and Benignus were submitted, is told so very briefly by Tírechán (p. 306_{17-24}) that it is not possible to compare it with the long relation of Muirchu (pp. 284_{25}–285_{15}). But observe that Tírechán (who may have simply written down the well-known tale from memory, without a book before him) adds that Patrick said, 'In hac hora consumpta est gentilitas Hiberniae tota.'

[58] *Trip.* p. 302_{24}.

[59] *Ibid.* p. 311_{28}, 'a senioribus multis ac ab illo Ultano.'

[60] *Ibid.* p. 307_{33}, 'ut senes mihi indicaverunt.'

founded. This is the thread on which all other details are strung or hung. And, so far as one can judge, the information must in many or most cases have been gained on the spot. Now the gathering together of this material was a work of considerable trouble and research, a work which no ordinary hagiographer would have been in the least likely even to think of undertaking. The original compiler, whether Tírechán or another, must have travelled about for the purpose; and we may, I think, set it down as highly improbable that any ecclesiastic—in Ireland or anywhere else—in the sixth or in the seventh century, made a systematic tour from a purely literary motive, to obtain material for a historical work.

What then was the motive which prompted the collection of this material? To enable us to judge the work of Tírechán this is a problem that demands solution.

8. We must turn to a passage (already briefly referred to) which, if not intended to assign a reason for Tírechán's special interest in the acts of St. Patrick, seems to be irrelevant.

Cor autem meum cogitat in me de Patricii dilectione quia uideo dissertores et archiclocos et milites Hiberniae quod odio habent paruchiam Patricii, quia substraxerunt ab eo quod ipsius erat, timentque quoniam si quaereret heres Patricii paruchiam illius potest pene totam insolam reddere in paruchiam, quia deus dedit illi totam insolam cum hominibus per anguelum domini, &c.[61]

The *paruchia* of Patrick has suffered and is in danger: this is the cry of Tírechán. It is better not to translate *paruchia* by diocese, because diocese suggests a different conception, quite alien from the institutions of the early Irish church. A *paruchia* was not a geographical division; it meant all the communities founded by one founder, wherever situated. The lands of the *paruchia Patricii* were the property of Patrick and passed to his heirs. Todd explains thus:—

The land granted in fee to St. Patrick, or any other ecclesiastic, by its original owner, conveyed to the clerical society of which it became the endowment all the rights of a chieftain or head of a clan; and these rights, like the rights of the secular chieftains, descended in hereditary succession. The *com-arb* or *co-arb*—that is to say, the heir or successor of the original saint who was the founder of the religious society, whether bishop or abbat—became the inheritor of his spiritual and official influence in religious matters. The descendants in blood, or 'founder's kin,' were inheritors of the temporal rights of property and chieftainship, although bound to exercise those rights in subjection or subordination to the ecclesiastical *co-arb*.[62]

Thus in each clerical community which he founded Patrick had

[61] *Trip.* pp. 311_{30}–312_{7}.

[62] *St. Patrick*, p. 149.

an heir or heirs ;[63] but his chief heir was at Armagh, his principal church. His successors at Armagh were regarded as his co-arbs in an eminent sense ; and in the seventh century, when Tírechán wrote, they claimed a certain authority over the other churches which he had founded—over the whole *familia* or 'muinntir' of Patrick. It is unknown to us at what time and in what form this claim, as asserted by Tírechán, was first urged, but it seems probable that the general line of development is correctly *suggested* in the 'Catalogus Sanctorum Hiberniae,' which has been elucidated at great length by Todd. For two generations or so after the death of Patrick the monastic communities of Ireland, founded by himself, his companions, and his disciples, formed a sort of confederacy, with common recognised principles ; and in this confederacy, real, though perhaps not formally organised, Armagh enjoyed a certain pre-eminence and dignity, but without any rights of jurisdiction.[64] Other communities, perhaps, would accept the excommunication pronounced by Armagh ; 'but Armagh was equally bound to obey the excommunication pronounced by any other church of the confederacy.'[65]

The situation was changed by the rise of a new school of ecclesiastical founders in the second quarter of the sixth century—such as the two Finnians and Columba. These men were innovators and introduced stricter monastic rules than those of the Patrician communities ; but the movement which they represent was, so far as we can see, a natural development within the Irish church towards a more rigid system. An utterly unwarranted inference in regard to this question has been drawn from the 'Catalogus.' The ideas of development and continuity in history are comparatively modern, and were utterly foreign to the author of that document, who, recognising that a new period is ushered in by Finnian, Ciarán, and their fellows—whom he calls saints of the second order—emphasises the break and does not seek to account

[63] The ecclesiastical and the temporal succession were sometimes combined in the same hands (cp. Todd, *op. cit.* pp. 154–6) ; but this does not concern us here. The account of the Paruchia Patricii which I have given, partly following Todd, is based on the actual, fragmentary evidence. It is at variance with the view of Zimmer (sketched in his *Keltische Kirche*), a view closely connected with his remarkable reconstruction of Patrick's life and work.

[64] It is probable that the (few) Patrician foundations in Leinster did not belong to this confederacy. Christianity had been introduced into Leinster many years before Patrick's arrival ; and the ecclesiastical history of the seventh century shows that it went its own way (cp. Bede, *H. E.* iii. 3), and that the cleavage between the northern and southern halves of Ireland affected the church. What we know of that history principally regards the Easter controversy, the best account of which will be found in Dr. MacCarthy's introd. to the *Annals of Ulster*, vol. iv. p. cxxxv *sqq.*

[65] Todd, *op. cit.* p. 94. The authority is the *Catalogus*, but, as the writer may have transferred later practice to the end of the fifth century, the statement ought not to be pressed. The date of the *Catalogus* seems to be the eighth century, or possibly the end of the seventh.

for it.[66] But he makes the statement (which has little to do with the main matter) that 'they received a mass from Bishop David and Gildas and Docus, the Britons.' On the strength of this, coupled with the fact that Gildas visited Ireland, modern writers have constructed the theory that the new movement of the sixth century was due to British influence. The grounds of the theory are in any case insufficient, but it breaks down chronologically.[67] Finnian of Clonard and Ciarán of Clonmacnois died in 549 A.D., while David's death seems fixed to 601 A.D., and the visit of Gildas to Ireland was in the reign of Ainmire (568–70 A.D.).[68] To substantiate the theory we should require proof of strong British influence on Ireland, say between 530 and 545 A.D., and no such proof exists. That there was constant intercourse between the British and Irish churches we need not doubt; but if Britain had exerted any decisive influence we should rather expect it to have been in the direction of making the Irish church episcopal.[69]

For the present purpose, however, it only concerns us to note that the communities of the new founders stood independent of and aloof from that confederacy of which Armagh was the most conspicuous member. The rise of these new communities in different parts of Ireland necessarily reacted upon the confederate Patrician communities; and we may feel some uncertainty whether it was due to the upgrowth of these new foundations, and to the need of a term of contradistinction, that the phrase *paruchia Patricii* first came into use, or whether that phrase originated at an earlier date, to distinguish Patrician from pre-Patrician foundations. In these circumstances, in the presence of an opposition, we can easily conceive that the co-arbs of Armagh would have been anxious to draw closer the ties which bound together the Patrician communities, and that, while they worked to establish a stricter organisation of the *paruchia*, they used the favourable opportunity to attempt to convert their recognised pre-eminence into definite rights of jurisdiction. Something of this kind would be likely to happen in any similar situation.

I have spoken of an opposition. It is expressed in the theory, which may have been formulated at Armagh in the course of the sixth century, that all Ireland was spiritually subject to Patrick and his co-arbs by the direct donation of God. This theory is announced in the passage of Tírechán which is under consideration,

[66] Cp. Todd, *op. cit.* p. 95; Fowler, introd. to *Adamnani Vita S. Columbae*, pp. xxxvi and l *sqq*. It seems hypercritical to say, as Zimmer says (*Keltische Kirche*, p. 209), that the author of the *Catalogus* brought the age of Patrick down to the death of Tuathal, 544 A.D. He merely regarded the first order as continuing after Patrick's death.

[67] This has been well shown by Zimmer, *ibid.* p. 224.

[68] *Vita Gildae*, ed. Mommsen, pp. 94–5.

[69] Cp. Zimmer, *Keltische Kirche*, ibid.

and it is expressed as follows in the 'Liber Angueli,' a document which was drawn up at Armagh, probably in the eighth century,[70] for the purpose of defining the privileges and rights of the see:—

Ac deinde donauit tibi Dominus Deus uniuersas Scotorum gentes in modum paruchiae, et huic urbi tuae quae cognominatur Scotorum lingua Ardd machae.[71]

Though the 'Liber Angueli' cannot be older than at most the beginning of the eighth century the legend that the donation of Ireland was conveyed to Patrick by an angel was known to Tírechán (*per anguelum Domini*),[72] and may have taken shape in the sixth century.

But we must distinguish between this theoretical claim to the whole island on the strength of a divine donation and the practical claim of the chief co-arb of Patrick over all the communities which Patrick actually founded. Now in the passage which we are considering Tírechán dwells upon the conceptions of the *familia Patricii* and the *paruchia Patricii*; and I understand him to argue that in theory the *paruchia* of the saint should embrace all Ireland, but that practically there is a narrower claim which ought to be admitted without hesitation or dispute. This is shown by the hypothetical form of the clause *si quaereret heres Patricii paruchiam illius*, implying that the heir does not claim all that whereto he has a divine right.

9. It is a certain inference from this passage that the bishop Tírechán was himself associated with some community belonging to the *paruchia* of Patrick. But there is another passage in which he leaves us in no doubt on this point. When he relates how Endeus, son of Amolngid, sacrificed his son and a part of his inheritance 'to Patrick's God and Patrick' he adds the remark—

Per hoc dicunt alii quia *serui sumus Patricii* usque in praesentem diem.[73]

There can be no question that this implies that Tírechán's community was established in Connaught,[74] and belonged to the

[70] Zimmer identifies the 'Liber Angueli' with the 'Lex Patricii' of the Annals (*Ann. Ult.* A.D. 734, 737, &c.), and dates it between A.D. 701 and 733 [734] (*Zeitsch. f. Deutsches Altertum*, xxxv. 78–9, 1891).

[71] *Trip.* p. 352_{33} = 'Cod. Armach.' fol. 20 v B.

[72] It might be held, but I do not see how it could be proved, that these words are an interpolation.

[73] *Trip.* p. 309_{31}.

[74] Todd (*St. Patrick*, p. 444, n. 2) needlessly hesitates because Tírechán is *supposed* to have belonged to the same family as Ultan, who reared him—namely, the Dal Conchobar of Meath. That may be so or not; but whatever his family, whatever his birthplace, there is no reason to doubt that his work, when he wrote his memoir, lay not in Meath, but in Connaught.

paruchia of which the co-arbs of Armagh claimed to be the heads. An incidental phrase in another passage agrees with the inference that the community to which he was attached was not in Meath. It is the phrase *in uestris regionibus*, by which the author designates Meath. If he had been himself a bishop in Meath he would naturally have written *in nostris regionibus*.

A difficulty is presented by the words *per hoc dicunt alii quia*, which require explanation. 'Through this grant some say that we are the servants of Patrick' might be taken to imply that Tírechán either disagreed with the view that his community owed loyalty to Armagh, or at least considered it an open question. This, however, cannot possibly be the meaning, as the longer passage which has been discussed sets in the clearest light his allegiance to St. Patrick's chosen seat. *Serui sumus Patricii* is evidently a statement of fact, not of opinion; and therefore the emphasis in the sentence rests on *per hoc*. The question touching which there might be two opinions was whether this act of Endeus was the act which conveyed to Patrick the ownership of the land of Tírechán's community. Others may have thought that Patrick acquired possession of it by a subsequent and particular grant. We are at liberty to infer that Tírechán's community was in the land of Amolngid, in northern Mayo.[75]

10. The claims of the co-arbs of Armagh naturally encountered resistance within the *paruchia* itself. A document in the Armagh MS., relating the foundation of the church of Trim and the original proprietor's grant of territory to Lomman, Patrick, and Fortchern, particularly observes that the spiritual successors of Fortchern, who was the first bishop, were all *uenerantes sanctum Patricium et successores eius*.[76] We may infer, Todd remarks, that this allegiance to Armagh was not universally given, 'or else it would not have been here so particularly mentioned in especial praise of these bishops.'[77]

As a member of the *familia Patricii*, and a loyal respecter of the rights of Armagh, Tírechán saw with dismay that these rights were being disregarded and infringed. 'I see,' he says, 'deserters and *archicloci* and armed men of Ireland hating the *paruchia* of Patrick, because they have taken from him that which was his. They are afraid, since they know that if the heir of Patrick should seek to claim his *paruchia* he could claim almost the whole island.'[78]

The expression *milites Hiberniae* can hardly admit of any natural interpretation but armed bands in the service of the kings of Ireland. If it meant generally the armed men of other kings

[75] Cp. Todd, *op. cit.* p. 445.

[76] *Trip.* p. 336_{17}.

[77] Todd, *op. cit.* p. 153.

[78] For the original see above, § 8 *ad init.* (p. 252).

and sub-kings, *Hiberniae* would have no point. The strange word *archiclocus* has been explained as derived from ἀρχικλώψ,[79] meaning 'archthief;' but, if so, it is clear that the writer must have had some motive for employing such a curious word. *Archiclocos* must by its very form have suggested the persons whom it was intended to designate. The collocation of *milites Hiberniae* suggests that the *archthieves* in question were the *archkings* of Ireland. *Archi-* was the Graeco-Latin equivalent for the Irish árd in such a connexion (árd-epscop = *archiepiscopus*).[80]

Dissertores has still to be explained. At first sight it might be thought that it meant *apostatae*, deserters of the Christian faith, and betokened a recrudescence of paganism. But it need not bear such an extreme significance. It need mean nothing more than men who, though bound by their position to uphold the *paruchia Patricii*, have been untrue to it—who, instead of supporting, have joined its enemies in injuring it. It may refer to communities founded, or alleged to have been founded, by Patrick, which repudiated the claims of the Armagh church and maintained their own independence.

As a special reason for disfavour shown towards the *familia Patricii* Tírechán assigns *non licet iurare contra eum et super eum et de eo, et non lignum licet contra eum mitti quia ipsius sunt omnia primitiuae aeclessiae Hiberniae.*[81] 'It is not lawful that wood shall be set against him.' Another passage in the memoir gives a clue to the meaning, though it does not furnish an explanation, of the curious phrase. It occurs in the account of the dispute of two men at Drummut Cerrigi, who wished to divide their father's inheritance. We are told 'that the wood of contention was set.'[82] The phrase may signify that the claimants fought in a wooden enclosure. But we may infer that to 'set wood against' Patrick meant to claim his inheritance. Claims on the church lands belonging to communities founded by Patrick might conceivably be made by the descendants of the chiefs who had originally granted the lands. Claims might also be put forward by co-arbs of other founders. Tírechán notes elsewhere an instance of monastic

[79] By Windisch; see *Trip.* p. 312, n. 1.

[80] Even this may not be the full explanation. It may be thought that, if this was all, a plainer word, such as 'archilatrones,' would have served the writer's purpose, and that his far-sought choice of 'archicloci' must have been made to give some more definite point to his allusion. It is remarkable that the one 'árd-rí' of Ireland to whose name 'archiclocus' might be intended to allude reigned in the days of Tírechán. This was Cellach (of the line of the northern Húi Néill), whose date is given as A.D. 643–658 (see *Ann. Ult.*; an alternative obituary date is given under A.D. 664). Is it possible that the word was specially selected to suggest Cellach's name, and to brand him as a violater of St. Patrick's rights?

[81] *Trip.* p. 312_{11-17}.

[82] *Ibid.* p. 320_{10}, 'lignum contensionis.' It should be recognised that the clause 'quod defunctum' ['definitum,' Stokes] 'est in terra more campi' is a gloss on 'caam,' with the etymological suggestion that 'caam' is connected with 'campus.'

aggression. He mentions that the *familia Clono*, which means Clonmacnois, 'holds many places of Patrick by violence.'[83] He records how different monastic communities disputed over the bones of Assicus, who was really a 'monk of Patrick.'[84]

The situation then, though the details are hidden, is clear enough in its general aspect for our present purpose. In the days of Tírechán there was active antagonism to the *paruchia Patricii*, and antagonism apparently from several quarters. The kings of Ireland seem to have looked with little favour on the pretensions of Armagh. Perhaps they conceived that those pretensions, if fully successful, would lead to the growth of an ecclesiastical state dangerous to the secular power. It may have seemed to them a wise policy to discountenance the idea of a *paruchia Patricii* and prevent union and organisation in the church. They may have thought that it was more to the interest of the royal power that the religious communities of the kingdom should be independent and isolated. All this is conjecture. We know nothing of the details of the struggle, which was doubtless complicated by disputes between clerics and laymen on such matters as rights of sanctuary, territorial boundaries, dues. We must be content to recognise that the *paruchia Patricii* had to contend with hostile forces, with the policy of the secular power, with the aversion of many communities for any form of subordination or dependence, and with the counter-claims of other monastic communities.

11. Tírechán was deeply interested in upholding and consolidating the *paruchia Patricii*. And the important point to observe is that not only is the special passage, in which he signalises this in so many words, an evidence of his solicitous interest in the question, but that his whole book is a practical service to the cause of the claims of Armagh. It is virtually a list of the churches which claimed to have been founded by Patrick. If it had been completed it would have exhibited the full extent of the *paruchia Patricii*. And it is to be observed that the incidents, whether legendary or not, with which Tírechán has enlivened his narrative of Patrick's foundations do not detract from the businesslike character of his work. On the contrary these anecdotes would rather have seemed to Tírechán and to his contemporaries circumstantial proofs of the saint's visits to the places with which they were associated.

We need have no hesitation, I think, in going a step further and saying that Tírechán meant his book to be what it is, and

[83] *Trip.* p. 314_{27}.

[84] 'Sed contenderunt eum familia Columbae cille et familia Airdd sratha,' *ibid.* p. 314_{7}. The quarrels of religious societies are illustrated by that between Durrow and Clonmacnois, which led to a battle, A.D. 764 (see *Ann. Ult.* sub a.; Todd, *op. cit.* p. 158), and that between Clonmacnois and Birr (Biror) in A.D. 760 (*Ann. Ult.* ad a.)

composed it in the interests of the *paruchia Patricii*. He was not a hagiographer, like Cogitosus and Muirchu, from whose Lives his work totally differs in character, but rather a practical churchman, writing a historical work with the special design of supporting a practical interest.

It is to be noted that we find in Tírechán no reference to the Roman controversy which agitated the Celtic church during his lifetime. The churches of southern Ireland had adopted the Paschal reckoning of the 'universal church' in the thirties of the seventh century; northern Ireland[85] did not yield till the very end of the same century. This accentuated the division between north and south during the intervening sixty years; and the situation may have seemed favourable for tightening the bonds connecting the Patrician churches which still held to the old usage. On the other hand it would seem that the way was prepared for the submission of 697 A.D. (or whatever the date was) by overtures from the south to the north. This is suggested by the notice that Bishop Aed of Sleibte visited Armagh before 688 A.D. and 'offered his kin and his church to Patrick for ever.'[86] The influence of this connexion may perhaps be detected in the work of Muirchu.

12. We have now reached the solution of the problem with which we started. We have found a motive sufficiently powerful to induce Tírechán to undertake the task of collecting the scattered material which he embodied in his work—a task involving considerable travel and labour. It seemed incredible that such a task should have been undertaken 'platonically' by a hagiographer; its accomplishment becomes comprehensible when we see that there was a practical object in view. We can now assert with confidence what before we provisionally assumed, that Tírechán did not transcribe his narrative of St. Patrick's journey from older documents; for if older documents, in which all these acts were set down, had existed they would have possessed an authority to which Tírechán would have eagerly appealed. It would have been in the interest of his cause to name them, and he could not have omitted to do so.

Tírechán then collected the material himself. There is an alternative possibility—for the criticism of his work it would make little difference—that some one else gathered the information and Tírechán cast it into the form of a book. This, however, would be a useless hypothesis, suggested by no evidence, whereas there is evidence which supports the most natural and simple supposition that Tírechán went about and collected his material for himself. Besides his visit to Armagh, already mentioned,[87] we know that he

[85] Except the Columban communities.

[86] *Trip.* p. 346_{23} (= 'Cod. Arm.' f. 18 r B). Segéne, then abbot, died in A.D. 688. (*Ann. Ult.* ad a.)

[87] Above, § 4; *Trip.* p. 313_{27}.

visited Alofind.[88] We know that he visited the great church of Saeoli, on the banks of a Galway lake.[89] He saw inscribed stones in Selce.[90] It would be natural to infer that he had also seen the Basilica Sanctorum, or Baslick—to the west of Selce—from the words '*ignoro nisi unum* [*locum*] in quo est bassilica sanctorum.' [91]

These incidental intimations confirm the conclusion that Tírechán himself visited the various places in which Patrick was said to have planted religious foundations, and set down all that he could learn from the seniors of the communities. His work shows that he pursued his investigation very thoroughly for Connaught; it was in north Connaught, as we saw, that his own place seems to have been situated. He had also done the same for Meath, though not completely, and if he had finished his work he would have had more to do for Ulster, and something for Leinster, which are only slightly touched. We are now in a position to appreciate more fully the truth of the conclusion that Tírechán's memoir is an unfinished work. It is inconceivable that, being what it is, it should have been wound up, as complete, without a word about the foundation of Armagh itself, to say nothing of Ath-Truimm and other important places.

Of the information thus locally collected by Tírechán the greater part probably came to him by word of mouth. We have already dealt (in § 5) with those passages which could be referred on tangible evidence to written sources. Excepting these, there are not more than one or two passages which might be singled out as heterogeneous and presuming sources in writing. I refer to the list of bishops, presbyters, deacons, and exorcists; [92] and to the story of the two daughters of King Loegaire at Crúachan.[93] As to the former, however, it would be difficult to show that it was not compiled by Tírechán himself out of material collected from various sources.[94] The story of the maidens was doubtless preserved in the neighbourhood of their grave. There is nothing to hinder us from supposing that it was Tírechán who put the tale in writing for the first time, taking it down from the mouth of one of the religious community which had been established near the *ferta*.[95] There is, indeed, in the sequel, which describes the conversion of

[88] Elphin (*ibid.* p. 313_{28}).

[89] *Ibid.* p. 313_{28-9}. The *Tripartite Life* (p. 96) renders Tírechán's words by 'Domnach mór Maigi Seolai,' and the place has been identified (by O'Donovan) with Domnach Patruig at L. Hackett.

[90] *Trip.* p. 319_{5}. Duma Selce (*Tripart. Life*, p. 106) was near Tulsk, in Roscommon.

[91] *Trip.* p. 318_{25}. [92] *Ibid.* pp. 304, 305. [93] *Ibid.* pp. 314_{30}–317.

[94] It might be argued that many of the clergy of this list are not mentioned elsewhere in Tírechán's memoir; but this argument cannot be pressed, as the memoir is incomplete.

[95] *Trip.* p. 317_{19}. The text should read, 'Et i[mmolata] est ferta . . . Patricio cum sanctarum os[sibus] et heredibus eius post [eum in] saecula et aeclessiam terrenam fecit in eo loco.'

the two magicians, an obscurity which almost looks as if Tírechán had transcribed from a document something which he did not quite understand. When one magician had been converted the other said—

> 'Frater meus credidit Patricio . . . . sed revertam eum in gentilitatem. Et ad Mathoum [et] ad Patricium verba dura dixit.

This is clearly the right punctuation, but *Mathoum* is mysterious. The sense requires a proper name, designating some one associated with Patricius. It may, therefore, be suggested that the true reading was *Mathonum*. Mathonus may have been the pre-Christian name of Benignus since the name of his sister was Mathona.[96] So we find a brother and sister named Catneus and Catnea.[97] The magician might appropriately rail against Benignus, who had played a leading part in the contest which was fatal to Lucetmael.

13. We have seen that Tírechán's memoir has no title, and that the introductory words, which state the authorship, were prefixed by his editor. We might be inclined to suspect that the editor was also responsible for the division into two books; and we might support the suspicion by the fact that at the beginning of book ii. Tírechán speaks of his work as a single *liber*.[98] This, however, proves nothing, as *liber* is ambiguous, and the principle of the division seems to forbid our imputing it to the scribe. If the subscription of book i. had been, *finit liber primus de Patricii gestis in regionibus nepotum Neill*, and the superscription of book ii. *incipit liber ii. de Patricii gestis in regionibus Connacht*, we might entertain the idea that the division, which roughly suits the incomplete work, was due to the editor. But the actual subscription and superscription define the sphere not of Patrick's but of the author's work: *Finit liber primus in regionibus nepotum Neill peractus; incipit ii. in regionibus Connacht peractus.* At one time I suspected that by a grammatical looseness *peractus* might be intended to express *de rebus peractis*. But that would be a daring and gratuitous assumption, which we should have no right to make, unless there were strong special reasons to demand it. As a matter of fact the results of this investigation justify us in taking the words in their literal and grammatical meaning. The first book was compiled *in regionibus nepotum Neill*; the second was composed in Connaught. This is in accordance with our conclusion that Tírechán gathered his material on the spot; and such a division of his work must have been signalised by the author himself.

14. The expression *in regionibus nepotum Neill* is ambiguous.

[96] 'Mathonam' occurred to me first, but Tírechán's narrative does not suggest that Mathona was with Patrick at Clebach (cp. p. 314_{18}), and the corruption is not so likely.

[97] *Trip.* p. 307_{31}.

[98] *Ibid.* pp. 311_{26}, 312_{19}.

Strictly it should mean Meath and the greater part of Ulaidh—the regions of both the southern and the northern Húi Néill—but here we can hardly be wrong in supposing that it refers specially to the kingdom of Meath, inasmuch as the material which the book contains relates entirely to Meath and was collected there. If Tírechán had finished his work he would have had more to say about Patrick's activity in Ulster, and perhaps he would have marked out a *liber tertius*. In any case the unfinished state of the work may account for the fact that the last two pages are concerned with acts of Patrick in Ulster, Meath,[99] Leinster,[100] and Munster.[101] There is indeed no objection to supposing that these paragraphs were composed in Connaught, at the author's headquarters. But he must certainly have contemplated, as I have already insisted, a fuller account of the saint's work in Ulster.

Apart from the abrupt termination the incompleteness of this last portion of the work is pressed upon us in another way. We are told that Patrick *relicta Machia uenit in Mangdornu*.[102] Patrick 'left Machia,' or Armagh; and the continuousness of Tírechán's narrative from Patrick's arrival in Ireland shows that this was the first time he visited the place. Not a word is said of the foundation of the Armagh church, not a word of Daire. The following words, *ordinauit Victoricum Machinensem episcopum*, mean 'he ordained Victoricus bishop of Domnach Maigen;[103] *Machinensem* is a mistake for *Maginensem*, due to the preceding Machia.

15. It may be matter for a moment's speculation whether Tírechán undertook the investigations which led to the composition of his memoir at the express instance of a co-arb of Armagh. It is at all events to be noted that subsequently some of the co-arbs took pains to supplement his incomplete work, and to gather information of the same kind concerning other Patrician foundations which he had omitted. These disjointed supplementary notices, including a very full account of the founding of Trim, were transcribed by Ferdomnach into the Armagh MS.; and the scribe's obscure Latin intimates that they were collected *curiossitate heredum*,[104] through the politic curiosity of the co-arbs. Some of these notices are in Irish, or in a mixture of Latin and Irish; and we may conjecture that Tírechán himself made notes, just like these, in the places which he

[99] *Trip.* p. 330_{26-29}. [100] *Ibid.* pp. 330_{30}–331_{7}.

[101] *Ibid.* p. $331_{8,9}$. The observation of Zimmer (*Keltische Kirche*, p. 210_{39}), 'Ebenso haben wir in den Noten Tirechans den Versuch, Patricks Thätigkeit in Nordirland (Connacht, Ulster, Meath) ausführlich zu schildern, und nur ein Satz meldet dass er auch nach Münster kam,' is not precise, for he omits to mention the visit to Leinster (see last note); and, as I have shown, he has not described 'ausführlich' Patrick's activity in Ulster (or probably in Meath) as it was known to him. But if it be true, as I have sought to prove, that Tírechán's work is incomplete, Zimmer's remark loses its point.

[102] *Trip.* p. 330_{21}. [103] Cp. *Tripartite Life*, p. 182. [104] *Trip.* p. 335_{3}.

visited, and afterwards worked them up into his continuous narrative in Latin.

16. It has been assumed throughout this paper that Tírechán's memoir is what it professes to be, the work of an alumnus of Bishop Ultan, and therefore composed in the seventh century. Its genuineness, however, was questioned by Professor Zimmer ten years ago,[105] and his strongest argument was the passage (beginning, *Tertio decimo anno Teothosii*) [106] recording that Patrick was sent by Celestine. This argument is no longer valid, as I have shown above that the passage in question has nothing to do with the memoir of Tírechán. Professor Zimmer has, indeed, in the meantime changed his opinions as to the genuineness of the Patrician documents in the 'Book of Armagh.' He now admits the genuineness of the 'Confession,' which he denied in 1891,[107] and he accepts Tírechán's memoir as a work of Ultan's pupil, though he regards it as having been augmented by *mancherlei Zusätze und Erweiterungen* between the date of its composition and the beginning of the ninth century.[108]

That the text of Tírechán has suffered interpolation is quite possible. There is, in particular, one obscure passage which Zimmer urged against the genuineness of the whole work, but which now he would regard as a *Zusatz*. It occurs in the story of the resurrection of the corpse in Dichuil. The dead man whom Patrick has raised says—

Ego sum macc maicc Cais maic Glais qui fui subulcus rig Lugir rig Hirotae. Iugulavit me fian maicc maicc Con in regno Coirpri Niothfer anno . c . usque hodie.[109]

In the brilliant article in which he maintains that the Fianna are really the vikings translated into the third century A.D., and that the prototype of the legendary Finn was a Scandinavian chief of the ninth century, Zimmer treats this passage and concludes that *fian*, along with the reference to a king of Hirota or Norway, stamps it as having been composed after 795 A.D. as the higher limit.[110] Now, though Zimmer's general theory may have much truth in it, his philological explanation of the words *fian* and *fiann* is highly problematical; and, until he has demonstrated that *fian* is not a Gaelic word, it cannot be admitted that the passage

[105] 'Keltische Beiträge,' iii. 77, 79, in *Zft. f. deutsches Altertum*, xxxv. 1891.

[106] *Trip.* p. 332_{19-28}.

[107] *Loc. cit.* p. 79, note.

[108] *Keltische Kirche*, p. 237_{36} *sqq*. As Zimmer now identifies Patrick with Palladius he admits his ordination by Celestine.

[109] *Trip.* p. 324_{34}. See the *Sanas Cormaic*, p. 29, ed. Stokes, *s.v.* 'mogheime.' In the version of the story in the *Tripartite Life* (p. 122_{24}) the swineherd is called 'Cass' instead of the 'grandson of Cass.' Probably this is simply an error.

[110] 'Keltische Beiträge,' loc. cit. p. 53, note, p. 77, note. Hiruath (=Hörötaland, on the Hardanger-fjord) was the old Irish name for Norway (Todd, *War of the Gaedhill with the Gaill*, p. xxxiv, note; cp. Zimmer, *Z. f. d. A.* xxxii. 205).

under consideration must necessarily date from the ninth century. Moreover there is a chronological difficulty. Can we esteem it probable that within a generation from the first viking settlements —before 846 A.D.,[111] the latest year in which we can place any part of the manuscript written by Ferdomnach—the vikings were already brought into connexion by popular imagination with heroes of the Cuchullin cycle? Cairbre Niafer, son of Ross Ruad, belonged to that cycle; he was slain by Cuchullin, and his son Erc cut off Cuchullin's head.[112] So far as our present evidence goes there is no real proof of an interpolation—even if a Norwegian king is mentioned.[113]

It is this apparent mention of a Scandinavian king that lends to Zimmer's view a superficial plausibility. But that there was in fact any reference to Scandinavia in this passage I could not bring myself to believe. Mr. E. J. Gwynn, to whom I went with my difficulty, discovered the true solution in one of the 'Dindsenchas,' in which Hiruait, or Hirót, occurs, designating not Scandinavia, but part of South Connaught. The context sets the meaning beyond all doubt.[114] This meaning of Hirót being established, it is evident that Lugair in our passage was an under-king in Connaught and

[111] Zimmer (*ibid.* pp. 94–5) suggests that Forannan, the co-arb of Armagh, who, driven out by Turgeis, spent some years in Munster (before his return to Armagh in A.D. 846), heard there of the Féna of Fid Mór (who are mentioned in a brief sentence, *Trip.* p. 342_{26}), and infers that 'Cod. Arm.' f. 162 B–18 v B was written after A.D. 841. Zimmer has also suggested that Lugair, king of Hirota, should be brought into connexion with a certain Lugair, son of Lugaid, who called in the Fomōri; see 'Annals of the Four Masters,' A.M. 4169 (B.C. 1023). He showed that the vikings of the ninth century were made into Fomōri (*Z. f. d. A.* xxxii. 242), and alleges this fact as a confirmation of his view of the passage in Tírechán. The argument is far-fetched.

[112] See 'Annals of Tigernach,' ed. Stokes, in *Rev. Celt.* xvi. 1895, p. 405 (cp. p. 407); the A tract, ed. by MacCarthy from the 'Book of Ballymote,' in *Codex Pal.-Vat.* 830, p. 286, and the B tract, *ibid.* p. 304, for the received chronology of Cairpre's reign. Scandinavian allies of the Ultonians are mentioned in the *Cath Ruis na Rígh for Bóinn* (ed. Hogan, p. 10 *sqq.*) This is a genuine instance of viking influence.

[113] Zimmer has shown (*Z. f. d. A.* xxxii. 230 *sq.*) that the acquaintance of the Irish with Scandinavia goes back to the beginning of the eighth century; it was probably much older.

[114] Stokes, 'The Rennes Dindsenchas,' in *Rev. Celt.* 1894 p. 301: 'Bladma, son of Cú, son of Cas Clothmín, son of Uachall, killed Bregmael, the smith of Cuirce, son of Snithe, king of Iruaith (rig Erota).' This does not enable us to identify Iruaith. The identification is supplied, as Mr. Gwynn has shown me, in the poetical version ('Book of Leinster,' 192):

'Curchi cendmar ba rí rot
for Medraige is for Herot.'

Curchi was king over Medraige (in Galway) and Herot. But the association of Herot with Galway is put beyond controversy by another verse of the same poem, which is not contained in the 'Book of Leinster,' but in the Trinity College MS. H 33 and the Stowe MS. B 22:

'ó áth cliath in Herut uill
cosin n áth cliath i Cualaind'—

that is, from Áth-cliath, in Herot (=Galway) to Áth-cliath in Cualand (=Dublin). It is a curious coincidence that in this story Blad mac Con mic Cais is the hero, and

had nothing whatever to do with Norway or the vikings. The geographical position of Hirót (whatever its limits were, and whatever relation it bore to Medraige) suits the story; for the sepulchre of the grandson of Cas was in the country of Macc Erce, *in regionibus Maicc Hercae*, in east Roscommon.[115]

The passage presents another difficulty—namely, the note of time volunteered by the grandson of Cas as to his death: *anno . c . usque hodie*, 'a hundred years ago.' This would place the reign of Cairbre Niafer about the middle of the fourth century. But in the legendary chronology of later days Cairbre and Cuchullin belong to the time of the Christian era. We should therefore have to infer that in the time of Tírechán the figures of Cairbre and the contemporary heroes had not yet been placed in their final chronological setting. This supposition might protect the reading *anno c*, if it were merely a question of the dating of Cairbre Niafer. But more than the problematical date of this mythico-historical person is involved. It is a question of the fourth-century kings of Ireland. There cannot be much serious doubt that the names of the high kings of the fourth century are correctly preserved, and were perfectly well known in the seventh century; so that it would have been impossible for any one to conceive Cairbre Niafer as king of Ireland a hundred years before Patrick. We may regard it as certain that the numeral is corrupt. It also occurs to one that there is a curious incongruity in representing the man just risen from the tomb as knowing how many years he had lain under earth. It may be suspected that the words *anno † c usque hodie* were not intended to be part of the speech of the swineherd,[116] but were added (in the margin, perhaps) by the author, to define the date of Cairbre—*hodie* meaning not St. Patrick's lifetime but his own. Such an emendation as *dcl* would suit the vulgar chronology but would not carry any conviction. Until the mythico-historical annals of pre-Christian Ireland have been critically sifted the question can hardly be treated.

that in the passage of Tírechán we have to do with a grandson of another Cas and with a mac Con; further, that Bregmael, whom Blad slew, was a *herd* ('buacoill') of the smith of King Cuirche.

[115] This country was once designated by a name which seems afterwards to have fallen entirely out of use—Tír Brotha. It is preserved in a legend (recorded in the *Tripartite Life*, p. 94_{14-27}) to the effect that Patrick found a mass of gold ('bruth nóir'), and gave it to the wizard Hono as a price for the land; hence the land was called the land of the mass ('tír in brotha'). The motive of the story is clearly etymological, to account for the old name of the region which it presupposes—Bruaith or Broth. The relative antiquity of the legend is proved by an entry in the Armagh MS., among those brief jottings which indicate events connected with Patrick's work. There we find the entry (*ibid.* p. 348_{19}) 'b. genus maicc Eirc,' which indicates this story: 'b.' stands for 'bruth,' and 'genus maicc Eirc' corresponds to 'cenel maicc Erce' in the passage in the *Tripartite Life*.

[116] As they are translated in *Trip. Life*, pt. ii. p. 122, 'Isin cétmad bliadain atáu cosindín.'

There is no evidence, that does not assume the unproven, to convict this passage as an interpolation; nor can I find any other passages which invite suspicion, except on the ground of some *a priori* theory. But I must refer to Zimmer's comment on the passage concerning the sepulture of Patrick in fol. 15 *verso* of the Armagh MS. Supposing this to be part of Tírechán's memoir he says, 'Tírechán testifies that the tomb of Patrick was not known in the seventh century,' and logically infers that the following account of the discovery of the grave at Saul by Columba (*Spiritu Sancto instigante*) is a later *Zusatz*.[117] The man who wrote *ubi sunt ossa eius nemo novit* could not have immediately proceeded to describe the identification of the tomb. Only the inference must now be stated in another form—namely, that the paragraph *In quatuor—novit*[118] and the next paragraph[119] are from two different sources, neither having anything to do with Tírechán.

17. We have reached definite conclusions as to what Tírechán's memoir represents, as to its scope, motive, and sources. We have discovered nothing which would force us to conclude that the document is not what it professes to be, the work of a writer of the seventh century. The criticism of the particular statements which he wrote down, the discussion of their credibility as objective history, cannot be undertaken without a preliminary investigation like that which has been attempted in the present paper. It is not proposed to enter upon such a detailed discussion here, but there is a general observation which it is important to make.

Tírechán's descriptions of the acts of Patrick at the places which he visited must be carefully distinguished from his description of Patrick's route. This will be clear if we consider the nature of his information. There is no difficulty in supposing that an ecclesiastical community might correctly preserve in its memory not only the fact that it was founded by Patrick, but also circumstances connected with its foundation, through a period of two hundred years. But it is a different thing to suppose that at each place which Patrick visited Tírechán could have discovered what had been the previous stage of his journey and what would be the next stage. It is impossible to see how any accurate or certain knowledge of Patrick's route could have been preserved except by means of a diary composed by Patrick himself or by one of his companions. And the hypothesis that any such document existed is, for reasons already urged, entirely out of the question. A document of such transcendent authority and import for the claims of Patrick's co-arbs, had it existed in the seventh century, could not have escaped mention. Tírechán would not have failed to appeal to it and indicate that he was following its statements. We must, therefore, regard the order of Patrick's acts, and the route along which

[117] *Keltische Kirche*, p. 208_{57}. [118] *Trip.* p. 332_{1-7} [119] *Ibid.* p. 332_{8-18}.

Tírechán conducts him, as largely Tírechán's own reconstruction, enabling him to use the narrative form. We can have no certitude that the foundations of churches were made in the order of his record, or that they were made in the course of a single circular journey. St. Patrick himself speaks—and his words are important—of frequent visits to various regions;[120] and we may be sure that all his establishments in any region were not accomplished on the occasion of his first visit. Tírechán indeed apprehended this to some extent. It is to be observed that when he has Patrick in the district of Calrige[121] he says nothing of his work there or of the grant of land which he obtained from Caichán.[122] If he had continued his memoir he might have introduced this incident at some later stage, and we might have heard more of Druim Lias.[123] Again, he takes Patrick through Armagh, as we have seen, but the fact that Armagh church was founded at a far later stage of Patrick's career was, we must suppose, so well known and universally admitted that he could not introduce it here.

It is particularly notable that in the account of the foundations in Meath Trim is ignored. Now Trim was peculiarly important for Tírechán's purpose, because it was one of those cases in which Patrick was not the sole 'grantee,' and consequently there was special danger of separation from the *paruchia Patricii* and of disputes between rival heirs. According to the story preserved through the 'curiosity' of the heads of the Armagh church Trim was founded on the very morrow, so to speak, of Patrick's arrival in Ireland.[124] That it was founded at an early period of his mission[125] may well be true. But the interesting story, though based on fact, is suspicious in regard to some of its circumstances, and from Tírechán's remarkable silence we shall be disposed to infer that he had different information, according to which the religious establishment of Trim did not follow quite so quickly upon the landing of Patrick in Ireland, and that it would have been noticed by him, if he had finished his memoir, at a later stage.

But, with certain exceptions, we have no good reason to suppose that any accurate knowledge of the order of Patrick's foundations was preserved in the seventh century. On the other hand we may acknowledge that, as a general rule, it was not only possible but highly probable that the founder should be remembered, and some of the circumstances of the foundation correctly handed down, often, of course, augmented by legend. As the rights of a community depended upon the original grant to its founder it was hardly possible that he should be forgotten. J. B. Bury.

[120] *Trip.* p. 372_{32} ('Confession'), 'omnes regiones quas [*sic corrigendum*] ego frequentius uisitabam.'

[121] *Ibid.* p. 328_{3}.

[122] *Ibid.* p. 338_{1} *sqq.*

[123] *Ibid.* p. 338_{16}; cp. *Trip. Life*, p. 144.

[124] *Trip.* p. 334_{7} *sqq.*

[125] Twenty-five years before the foundation of Armagh (*ibid.* p. 335_{10}, which is at variance with the notice in *Ann. Ult.* sub a. 444).

Notes and Documents

Supplementary Notes on Tírechán's Memoir of St. Patrick.

I.

In my paper in the April number of this Review[1] I made considerable use of the Irish Annals in dealing with a passage in Tírechán. I hope on a subsequent occasion to offer some observations on the authenticity of those Annals for the fifth century A.D., but here I wish to point out, what I think has not been noticed, that the early entries in the breviarium '*do flaithesaib ocus amseraib Herenn iarcreitim*,' contained in the 'Book of Leinster' (inc. f. 12 v° A), depend on the tradition of the Annals, and are in general agreement chronologically with the entries in the 'Annals of Ulster.' Extracts from this document are given in Todd's 'St. Patrick' (pp. 184–8), but it has been printed in full with a translation by Dr. Stokes ('Tripartite,' vol. ii. p. 512 *sqq.*) But as the chronological harmony with the Annals is not exhibited in this edition by those dates which the editor has supplied, and as there are one or two slight inaccuracies in the text, it will not be amiss to print here a small portion of the document, as far as A.D. 526, adding the dates and some explanations. I give the original Latin, and substitute English for Irish :—

iiii m ccclxxxiiii. Loegaire macc Néill xxx annos regnum Hiberniae post adventum Patricii tenuit. [The marginal number refers to *adventum Patricii*, and represents A.D. 433, on the Bedan era 3952.]

[A.D. 447.] Ard macha fundata est ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a*].

[A.D. 447.] Secundinus et [A.D. 457] Senex Patricius quieverunt [see 'Ann. Ult.' *ad annos*].

cccclxiii. Loegaire fell beside Cass, &c. ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a.* 462.]

cccclxxxiii. Ailill Molt son of Dathi (reigned) twenty years, till he fell in the battle of Ocha, by the hands of Muredach son of Erc, and

[1] I may take the opportunity to correct a misstatement on p. 30, n. 114, of that article. It is wrongly asserted there that the verses *ó áth cliath in Herut*, &c., do not appear in the 'Book of Leinster.' What I should have said was that the description of Bregmael as a herd is wanting in that MS. The error was due to a clumsy reference in my rough copy.

Fergus Cerbél son of Conall Cremthainne, and Fiachra Lond son of Caelbad, and Crimthann son of Enna, king of Laigin. [The marginal A.D. (which is quite distinct except the first *c*, which is faint) refers to the words *cotorchair icath Ocha*, and gives the date of Ailill's death as A.D. 483: see the alternative dating of the battle of Ocha entered in the 'Ultonian Annals' under that year.]

[A.D. 466.] Eogan Macc Neil moritur ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

[A.D. 467.] Quies Benigni † fí episcopi [*sancti* Rolls ed.; possibly *secundi*. 'Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

[A.D. 480.] Death of Conall Cremthainne son of Niall ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

[A.D. 482.] Quies Iarlathi tertii episcopi ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

[A.D. 482.] Bellum Ocha in quo cecidit Ailill M(olt). [The *m* after Ailill is quite clear in the manuscript, though not in the facsimile. As the latter entry is identical with that in 'Ann. Ult.' *sub a.* 482 I have attached this date, whereas the dated notice above of the same event is in Irish and corresponds to the entry in 'Ann. Ult.' *sub a.* 483.]

[A.D. 484 ?] Lugaid son of Loegaire (reigned) 25 [xxu MS.] (years), till he fell in Achad Forcha [2] through a miracle of Patrick. [Cp. 'Annals of Tigernach' *ad ann.* 508, ed. Stokes, *Rev. Celt.* xvii. 126.

[A.D. ?] Muridach Macc Eogain moritur.

[A.D. 490.] Bellum Cellosnaid ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

[A.D. 493.] Patricius Scottorum episcopus (quievit).

[A.D. 497.] Cormac primus abbas (quievit) ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

[A.D. 500.] Quies Ibari episcopi ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

dxxxiii*i*. Murchertach son of Erc (reigned) 24 (years), till he fell into a jar of wine at Clettech. [*In dolio pleno vino*, 'Ann. Ult.' A.D. 534. Here again, as in the case of Ailill Molt, the marginal number is the date of the obit. The trace of a fourth unit, very indistinct, may be detected in the manuscript. This notice, and that of Lugaid, seem to imply the dates A.D. 509 for Lugaid's death and A.D. 510 for Murchertach's accession.]

[A.D. 513.] Dubthach abb(as) Aird Macha quievit ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

[A.D. 516.] Bellum Dromma Dergaige unde campus Mide a Lagninensibus ablatus est ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

[A.D. 526 ?.] Dormitatio sanctae Brigitae [cp. 'Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

[A.D. 526.] Ailill i abbas Aird Macha (quievit) ['Ann. Ult.' *ad a.*].

It may be pointed out that this document, which consists largely, though not exclusively, of obituary dates, may explain the interpolation of Secundinus and *Patricius senex* into lists of the coarbs of Patrick, such as that in the 'Book of Leinster,' f. 21 v° C, and the others given by Todd ('St. Patrick,' pp. 173 *sqq.*) All the ecclesiastics whose deaths are entered down to the year A.D. 526 were, with the exception of these two and St. Bridget, abbots of Armagh. We can therefore easily conceive that the compiler of a list of coarbs, working from such a chronological breviary as this, might have fallen into the mistake of supposing that Secundinus and

[2] Here at the end of a line there are some letters, apparently *dmn*.

Patricius Senex were, like Benignus and Iarlathus, successors of Patrick at Armagh. The author of the document was guiltless of this error, as his *Iarlathi tertii episcopi* testifies.

II.

I omitted to observe one interesting source of which Tírechán probably availed himself. He saw inscribed stones near Lake Selce, *in cacuminibus Selcae*, where Patrick and his companions encamped *et posuerunt sibi stratum et sedem inter lapides in quibus scripsit manus sua literas quas hodie conspeximus oculis nostris.* Tírechán then goes on to enumerate the names of ten clerics and two women who were with the saint. This is the only place where he introduces a list like this in the course of his narrative (apart from the long catalogue of bishops and others whom Patrick ordained in fol. 9 v), and the question arises, from what source did he elicit the names of those who happened to be with Patrick on this occasion? The question is pertinent and cannot be set aside, because no incident involving any of the persons recorded to have been present is mentioned in connexion with the sojourn at Lake Selce, and it is scarcely conceivable that oral tradition should have preserved a list of persons who merely encamped on a certain occasion in a certain place. The obvious solution is that Tírechán copied the names which he gives from the inscribed stones which he saw; the inscriptions partly at least consisted of these names. The explanations and descriptions added to some of them are manifestly due to Tírechán himself. We may fairly infer from the tabular form in which this list appears in the Armagh MS. that the names were written in tabular form in Tírechán's original manuscript, in the order in which he found them on the stones. It seems probable that the names of the sisters of Felartus were not inscribed (as it is to be presumed that Tírechán would have copied them); they may have been described as *II sorores Felarti.* The lines which concern them are almost illegible in the manuscript, but the derived passage in the 'Tripartite Life' (p. 108, Rolls ed.) enables us to restore as follows:—

Felartus episcopus de	fuit [in insola]
genere aile[llo]	in mari [conmaicne]
[et] soror [eius]	quae sic vocat[ur c]roch cuile [3]
[et altera] sor[or quae]	

It is hardly necessary to emphasise the interest and importance

[3] The editor of the *Tripartite* adds another name [*Bitheus*] to the list of clerics, inserting it before *Casil Irre*, p. 108. He has taken this from Colgan, *Trias Th.* p. 136; but *Casil Irre* clearly refers to the connexion of Bronus with that place; see *ib.* pp. 138, 140. The last four lines of fol. 12 v° B are nearly quite illegible; the little that can be made out has been deciphered by Dr. Gwynn (as above), but they can be restored with tolerable certainty from the *Tripartite Life*, p. 108.

of this passage. It contains what I think must be allowed to be an unquestionably genuine record of the existence in the seventh century, on a hill near Lake Selce, of stones inscribed with the names of Patrick and twelve of his followers. And probability is entirely in favour of the assumption that these inscriptions were genuine, and were actually scored by Patrick and his companions.[4]

When we come to consider this list more closely, it may strike us as noteworthy that while the title *episcopus* is added to the names of Bronus and Felartus it is not appended to that of Sachellus, who was also a bishop, nor to that of Benignus (*heres Patricii*). Similarly *prespiter* is attached to Bronachus, but not to the others who were likewise presbyters—namely, Rodanus (see 'Trip.' p. 314_{14}), Cassanus (p. 349_{19}), Lommanus, and Brocidius (p. $395_{3,5}$). This observation may give us a clue to the arrangement of the names. The two bishops Bronus and Sachellus come first, then follow the presbyters, headed by Bronachus; but the title *episcopus* which is attached to Bronus is not repeated with Sachellus, and *prespiter*, which designates Bronachus, is left to be understood with the names of his fellow priests. It may be inferred that Benignus, the coarb of Patrick, and Felartus, whose names occur among the presbyters, held that rank when the stones were inscribed, and had not yet been ordained bishops. We cannot be certain that the author of the 'Tripartite Life,' part 2, had any good authority for his additional statement (p. 106) that Patrick wrote the words *Iesus*, *Salvator*, *Soter* on three stones. But it agrees remarkably with the conjecture which the foregoing considerations naturally suggest, that three stones were inscribed, on one of which Patricius Episcopus appeared alone. On a second—

Bronus Episcopus
Sachellus

On a third—

Bronachus Prespiter	Benignus
Rodanus	Benignus
Cassanus	Felartus
Brocidius	II sorores Felarti
Lommanus	

III.

I take this opportunity to withdraw my provisional acceptance of the suggestion in 'Tripartite,' Rolls ed., vol. ii. p. 312, note 1, that *archiclocos* in 'Cod. Arm.' f. 11 r° B is equivalent to ἀρχίκλωπας. Reflexion has convinced me that this assumption of the change from *p* to *c* in the case of a very rare if not unique loan-word, such as this would be, cannot be maintained.

[4] Tírechán's *scripsit manus sua* means *scripsit manus ipsius*, not *scripserunt manus ipsorum*.

The established cases of this change—chiefly, if not wholly, loan-words which came into Irish through Brythonic—do not support it. The true solution is much simpler. The second *c* in the word is either redundant[5] or a mistake for *l*, and what Tírechán wrote was *archilocos* or *archillocos*—that is, *Archilochos*, meaning malignant poets or satirists. It does not surprise us to find ecclesiastical communities complaining of the satirical attacks of the poets of Ireland; but in this context one is almost tempted to speculate whether the poets, whose cause had been espoused by Columba at the council of Drumceatt, had supported the *familia Columbaecille* in some quarrel with the *familia Patricii*. The reference to the Greek poet does not necessarily imply any direct knowledge of Greek literature on the part either of Tírechán or of Ultan, from whom, we may suspect, Tírechán obtained the phrase; Horace's *Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo* is sufficient to account for it.

J. B. Bury.

Two Unpublished Letters of Hadrian IV (1155).

The following two letters of Pope Hadrian IV, neither of which is mentioned in Jaffé and Wattenbach's 'Regesta Pontificum Romanorum,' are found at the end of a manuscript of 'Hegesippus de Bello Iudaico,' of the latter part of the twelfth century, preserved in the cathedral library at Worcester (Cod. F. 30.)[1] The second of them is written in a more formal hand than the other, with elongated letters in the top line. I owe the transcripts to the kindness of my friend Mr. S. G. Hamilton, fellow of Hertford College, Oxford.

In the first letter, announcing his election, the pope already on 4 Feb. 1155 addresses Archbishop Theobald as legate; in the second, dated eighteen days later, he informs the archbishop of York and the people of the English provinces generally that he has appointed Theobald to the office which he had enjoyed under Eugenius III and Anastasius IV. His silence as to any commission from their predecessors confirms the view taken by Bishop Stubbs[2] that when the commission held by Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester, lapsed on the death of Innocent II in 1143, it was not granted to Canterbury, either by Celestine II or Lucius II, as it certainly was not renewed to Winchester.[3] This letter is of

[5] To intrude a letter into a word which already contains the same letter more than once is a natural slip for a copyist to make. Thus I met the other day in a manuscript *Corirpri* for *Coirpri*.

[1] See the description by H. Schenkl in the *Sitzungsberichte des philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, cxxxix. (1898), 9, p. 46 *seq.*, for a reference to which I am indebted to Professor Liebermann.

[2] *Const. Hist. of England*, § 380.

[3] John of Hexham, contin. of Symeon of Durham, § 17 (*Opp.* ii. 316, ed. Arnold)

The Long Time Belief T

by adoption. He is known to have come from a noble family.

St. Patrick himself states in his Confession that he was born "in the village of Bonavem of Tabernia." The old saint may have meant well when he penned the information, but future historians are still at sea. Some declare that the saint was speaking of Kirkpatrick, near Glasgow, Scotland, and others insist that he meant a small place in northern France, near Boulogne.

SQUIRRELS' WORK AS TREE PLANTERS

Acorns Stored in Ground for Winter Food Sometimes Forgotten.

HAS it ever occurred to you who are the real gardeners of the forests?" asked an old friend of the Central Park squirrels. "I never heard a theory propounded that animals plant trees, but from what I have observed during ten years of friendship with the Park squirrels I am satisfied they, and not the acorn, are father of the oak.

"Whether a squirrel plants trees impelled by instinct I am not prepared to say. Their industry may be explained by a less far-fetched theory. Observe any squirrel during nutting time and see how busy he is laying in a stock of provisions for Winter. Bushels and bushels of acorns and nuts are gathered by the little fellows and stored in the hollows of trees and in other accessible nooks. When these are filled the squirrel buries his treasures in the ground. Busily, like a streak of gray lightning, he whisks about under oaks picking acorns and burying them in the ground in a thousand and one spots. From sunrise to sunset he and his mates are busy storing away the precious Winter supply.

"The buried nuts are the first consumed by the wise little animal, who knows a time will come soon when the ground will be frozen hard and covered with snow, after which the supply tucked away in trees must be depended upon. Many of the acorns buried by the squirrels in Winter are forgotten. Others are buried under snow before he has a chance to dig them out. In either case, an acorn has been planted as delicately as if [illegible] ex-perts. Wise physicians are now fully recognized. Wise physicians are now fully recognized. The importance of the Columbia course has of late years been such Gymnastics as will form part of the Faculty at its head. The importance of just corrective education with a member of the [illegible] department of physical and [illegible] has just been announced, is about to establish a special department of physical and gymnastics that Columbia University, as with his own hand. On the seventeenth day of March was Patrick translated to the heavens." The document is in Latin, some ten and [illegible] answer-ing in the position. [illegible] in need of correction.

This community is so full of children and encouragement.

ever her quick eye detects the necessity for ing with mild badinage, encouraging when-ever her quick eye detects the necessity for intended to strengthen the muscles of the abdominal region. All the while the brisk little teacher works harder than her pupils, commanding, entreating, occasionally taunt-ing, under protest, evolutions specially [illegible] Winter [illegible]

[illegible] Tips! Just important change in the bill since [illegible] Senate.

[illegible] amendment when the bill comes up in the [illegible] will be advocated by Senator Pavey in an [illegible] [illegible] bill [illegible]

holy sunshine—in the words of the old Anglo-Norman *trouvère*, a land of

its head, which seriously jeopardized the success of the miracle. An angel, however, appeared in the nick of time and repaired the drum. The instrument with its patched head—the mending though, done divinely, had not been accomplished so skilfully as to escape detection—was long exhibited as a holy relic.

CONQUERS A MONSTER.

Up in the Galtee Mountains, situated between the counties of Cork and Tipperary, the good saint had the time of his life with a monster serpent. St. Patrick finally got hold of the reptile and chained him in Lough Dilveen, one of the seven famous lakes of that district.

"Stay there until Monday," said the saint.

The serpent, it is said, still lies in the bottom of Lough Dilveen. All the folks about the place say that he is there and every Monday calls out in Irish:

"It's a long Monday, Patrick."

SOME OF HIS MIRACLES.

The miracles accredited to St. Patrick are numerous and varied. A popular legend relates that the saint and his followers one bitter cold morning found themselves on a mountain without a fire to cook their breakfast and warm their chill bodies. The followers began to complain. St. Patrick, however, regarded the situation with apparent indifference.

"Make a pile of ice chunks and snowballs," said the saint.

The followers did as directed. The good saint then kneeled by the pile and breathed on it. Lo! flames broke forth from the pyre of ice and snow.

IRELAND'S FIRST DISTILLER.

Poteen, a favorite beverage in Ireland, is said to have derived its name from St. Patrick. He, according to the legend, was the first to instruct the Irish in the art of distillation. There is not much foundation for this legend, however. Most authentic historians make the saint out a strict teetotaller. In fact, he might very well be the patron saint of the W. C. T. U. There is a record that in 445 he commanded his disciples to refrain from drink in the day time, until the bell rang for vespers. One Colman, the story goes, although busily engaged in the field, exhausted with fatigue and suffering from an intolerable thirst obeyed the mandate so literally that he did not drink even a drop of water during a long sultry harvest day. Colman held out all day, but just as vespers rang, overcome with exhaustion, he dropped dead. Colman's memory is preserved to-day. He is called Stadhach (the thirsty).

A CHIEFTAIN'S BAPTISM.

A story which has formed the theme of several pictures and which may be more than a legend, tells how St. Patrick was baptizing an Irish chieftain. The saint during the ceremony unwittingly placed his crozier on the great toe of the converted chieftain. The pious chief, ignorant of Christian rite and believing the presence of the crozier on his toe was an essential part of the ceremony, never flinched, even though the saint inadvertently leaned heavily on the crozier. Blood flowed freely from the wound so freely that the place [illegible] named St.

nt with flowers,
ess bowers,
to see,
g from the boughs;

orn
e.

s not hard for the
abit of connecting
with the personal
to attribute to
ost pleasing and
om from venom-

possible. In the
t. Patrick, surely
entury, and thus
told the famous
Patrick on Croa-
Mayo). In it oc-
h the demons:
r was at hand, the
lth devils in shapes
of cursing against
is bell until a gap
see forthwith upon
drown themselves
the land of Ireland
n days and seven
finitely).

ubrey De Vere:

one low voice,
th bitterer scoff.
fierce in wrath, is

lth one day."
d the night;
arth and sky;
pan's wave,
doom.

ges of Jocelyn he
precisely where
trick, and hence,
lished headlong
of Croagh Pat-
dealized replica
-suggested to a
understand the
luction of snakes
ure absence was
rick's great and
T. J. S.

T. PATRICK.

s Well as His
erstood.

ork Times:

as made a mis-
he "natal day"
has won the rac
had it down to
to practice the
stake in a race
it, in whipping
a knack, or a tric
home in advance
caught the luck
lengths behind a
instances in whi
of the contest.
ment of chance to
away course.
championship ra
and fair compet
to prove conclus
noon said that ye
the Executive Co
the National Asso
Frederick R. Lin
care little so long
racing clubs a
But this is a sec
Worcester, Mass.
upon the Patap
year will be he
whether the Na
It will also be
national regatta
r may be settled
and express their views as to that the mat-
sion, and arrangements are expected to attend

WRITINGS OF ST. PATRICK

Contain Authentic Records of the Apostle's Life.

IT IS a characteristic of our age," says Prof. Maclean in his "Literature of the Celts," to doubt, if not to deny, the historical reality of many of the historic figures that hover in the background of history. And such a doubt has extended even to St. Patrick, due largely to the fact that he is not mentioned by the early historians, Prosper of Aquitaine (A D 402-463) and Bede, (A. D. 673-735,) both of whom attribute the conversion of Ireland to Palladius."

This seeming omission, however, has been explained by the theory that St. Patrick and Palladius are one and the same person. Succat, the saint's baptismal name, in the ancient British language means "Good at war," (modern Welsh hygad, warlike,) and is accurately translated by Palladius, (from Palius,) a common Roman name at that period. As a Roman citizen, and moreover of noble birth, the saint must have had more than one name, and doubtless his praenomen was Patricius. It would therefore be appropriate to call him St. Patricius, for, as Mr. Andrew Lang says, "'St. Patrick' almost inevitably suggests an Irishman and Patricius was none."

Before proceeding further it may be stated that all the dates concerning St. Patrick are elusive and uncertain. The most likely dates, and those most in accord with the historical evidence, are those suggested by Dr. Whitley Stokes, the distinguished editor of the "Tripartite Life" of St. Patrick. The dates suggested by this scholar are: Birth A. D. 373, first missionary advent to Ireland, 397, second advent in 432, and death in 463. But, as Prof. Maclean remarks, "after all has been said and searched, we are dependent for the essential features and outstanding facts of his life upon the Apostle's own writings," and these unfortunately for us contain no dates.

The authentic records of St. Patrick's life are fairly numerous and of great age, dating back indeed almost to his own handwriting. The first is the autobiographical "confession," preserved for us in an abridged form in the Book of Armagh, one of the finest and oldest of the Irish manuscripts, written in 812 by a scribe, Ferdomnach. That the scribe had before him the actual autograph manuscript of the saint may be inferred from his own words: "Thus far the volume which Patrick wrote with his own hand. On the seventeenth day of March was Patrick translated to the heavens." The document is in Latin, quite archaic in its composition, answering to the description St. Patrick gives of his own writing. In addition to the "Confession," there are the "Epistles to Coroticus," (also in Latin,) and the hymn variously known as the "Lorica," "Deer's Cry," or "Guard's Cry," (in Gaelic,) assigned to St. Patrick.

The "Confession," St. Patrick tells us, he wrote in his old age, and that its object was to defend himself from the charge of presumption in undertaking the work he tried to perform among the Irish. The work, though called a "Confession," is rather to be considered as an Apologia pro vita sua. It has been well described as the fervid outpourings of a zealous early Christian, anxious only to clear himself from the charge of worldliness, and absolutely devoid of those appeals to general interest which we meet with in most of

ation gives us of the progress of his and the multitude of his converts, it is certain that the whole of Ireland did not submit to Patrick's influence, as he admits in his "Confession" that he looked daily for a violent death or to be brought back to slavery, (redigi in servitutem,) and there is some evidence that a partial apostasy took place during the two centuries following his death.

He died at Saul, (Sabhal,) while on a visit there from Armagh, and his burial-place is believed to be at Downpatrick in County Down.

It was inevitable that in the course of ages around the simple early narrative of the saint's life there should accumulate a mass of traditional, legendary, and even fictitious matter, which, added to from time to time, should form what is now commonly known as the "Life of St. Patrick."

NEW VIEWS OF ST. PATRICK.

Belief That His Name as Well as His History Is Misunderstood.

To the Editor of The New York Times:

Gov. Folk of Missouri has made a mistake in calling March 17 the "natal day of Ireland's patron saint." It is the anniversary of the happy completion of his life work, the end of the beginning of it which the Irish people celebrate, according to the recognized standard rule of the Catholic Church. Nearly all Protestant historians have made the same mistake.

I hold that the title "Patrick" (the Irish for Patricius), was conferred upon him by Pope Celestine, and not "Patric," the Irish for the Latin Patricius. This was because the Irish Bishops who attended the first synod, held at Cashel, who were all Home Rulers, refused to recognize his primary until the Pope conferred it upon him, as Patriarch of the Irish Church. Archbishops were not created in Ireland until 1250.

I have before me a map of the old Roman Empire. On it are all the evidences, according to Probus, the earliest historian of St. Patrick, that he was born in Banes, in the territory of Brittany near Namnetes, (Nantes,) adjacent to the Loire, on the Cantabrian Sea, (now the Bay of Biscay.) All authorities recognize Probus as the original and most reliable writer of all the shameful historiums of St. Patrick. The great discrepancies between them have arisen from the [illegible] of the Irish [illegible]

[illegible] continued, but they confounded his death anniversary with that of his birth; they make him to have been 120 years old when Lenigan says he was only 75.

Colgan could not find Namnetes (Nantes) on the maps of his time, so he calls it, in Irish, "Nem Thur," which he arbitrarily says means "Holy Tours." Usher, too, could not find it, nor Banues, also called Vannes, (in Latin, Banneurum,) so he picks up a village in Scotland, near Dumbarton, and thinks that might be it. Banues, on the Cantabrian Sea, they jumble with "Banneurum, of the Tabernae, on the Tourenian Sea."

Then some of them confound the Tourenian Sea with the Tyrrhenian Sea. Langhorne, as well as Probus, shows that St. Patrick was captured on the coast of Brittany, in France, by the Irish Chief Niall, when he harassed the Romans, then in possession of Gaul, by a descent upon their maritime towns in the vicinity of their great port at the mouth of the Loire—Namnetes, now Nantes; to which Banues (or Vannes) was closely connected, and built on the Cantabrian Sea (now the Bay of Biscay.)

JAMES C. HOGAN.

New York, March 19, 1916.

SQUIRRELS' WORK AS TREE PLANTERS

Acorns Stored in Ground for Winter Food Sometimes Forgotten.

HAS it ever occurred to you who are the real gardeners of the forests?" asked an old friend of the Central Park squirrels. "I never heard a theory propounded that animals plant trees, but from what I have observed during ten years of friendship with the Park squirrels I am satisfied they, and not the acorn, are father to the oak.

"Whether a squirrel plants trees impelled by instinct I am not prepared to say; their industry may be explained by a less far-reached theory. Observe any squirrel during nutting time and see how busy he is laying in a stock of provisions for Winter. Bushels and bushels of acorns and nuts are gathered by the little fellows and stored in the hollows of trees and in other accessible nooks. When these are filled the squirrel buries his treasures in the ground. Busily, like a streak of gray lightning, he whisks about under oaks picking acorns and burying them in the ground in a thousand and one spots. From sunrise to sunset he and his mates are busy storing away the precious Winter supply.

"The buried nuts are the first consumed by the wise little animal, who knows a time will come soon when the ground will be frozen hard and covered with snow, [illegible] the supply tucked away in [illegible] must be depended upon. [illegible] many of the acorns buried by the [illegible] are forgotten. Others are [illegible] under snow before he has a [illegible] to dig them out. In either case, an [illegible] has been planted as delicately as it

ick Doubt as to the Exact Birthplace of Patrick, Famous Patron Saint, Four Countries Claiming the Honor—Is Stolen by Pirates When a Youth and Sold in Ireland Becomes a Priest, Is Sent Back to the Emerald Isle, Converts the Chieftains, Rites the People, Drives Out the Snakes, Conquers a Monster, Performs Miracles and Dies at a Ripe Old Age Somewhere Around March 17, 465—Nowhere More Popular Than in America.

Although the fact is not generally appreciated by those other than Celts the commemoration of St. Patrick's Day is not a sectarian celebration but a pure and simple national holiday, at least as far as New York city is concerned. It would be as reasonable to assert that George Washington's Birthday is an Episcopalian holiday as to restrict St. Patrick's Day to the Catholic Irishmen. St Patrick was a missionary of the Roman Catholic Church it is true, but, more than that, he was a national hero, a prominent figure in early Irish history, whose achievements were not the less great because at present they have been somewhat undone by British domination.

St. Patrick stands to Ireland much as Solon stood to the Athenians and Lycurgus to the Spartans. But he occupies an even more important position. He was more than a lawgiver. He was an educator and above all, the builder of Ireland as a nation. Previous to his work Ireland had maintained an insecure confederation of provinces, that were themselves broken up into petty tribes and clans. St. Patrick was the means of bringing these closer together for mutual protection and welfare. Over a diplomat, St. Patrick never attempted material changes. His achievements consequently do not seem startling at first sight. But the transformation that he wrought in Ireland was none the less complete. By modification of old institutions the politic saint brought about better conditions without the Irish chiefs having an inkling that they were being reformed.

All accounts credit St. Patrick with being an unassuming, unostentatious man who sought nothing but the welfare of the Irish people, chiefs and peasantry. He is said to have had a ready wit and the genius of good fellowship. He was not an Irishman by birth, but one by nature.

HISTORY OF ST. PATRICK OBSCURE.

Concerning the history of Ireland's patron saint there is much obscurity. Facts relative to his early life, as should be the case in the chronicles of saints and heroes, are extremely shadowy and confused, although they are numerous. Some one with an affection for dates and an indifference for certainty has settled that the saint was born somewhere about A. D. 372. Seven cities claimed to be the birthplace of Homer; St. Patrick falls somewhat behind that record, but does very creditably. Four countries, Scotland, England, France and Wales, each insert that Ireland's saint was her son. Ireland herself seems to be the only land with a vestige of a claim that does not attempt to appropriate St. Patrick. Irishmen, however, are agreed that the enemy of reptiles, when once he had become ne-

found, were the Druids. In ancient faith, this hierarchy was not extremely opposed to anything in innovation. Consequently they fought St. Patrick bitterly. Being subjects imagine they would have been [illegible] for any one less endowed with miracle and saint power than S. Patrick.

CONQUERS IRELAND.

In addition to these occult powers the saint, although a simple and somewhat unlettered man, was a discreet diplomat as well as an enthusiastic missionary. The Druids were formidable opponents. The belief in their power was ancient and deep rooted. Their disposition was to do harm rather than good; so they were greatly feared by the people. St. Patrick, in spite of his mild disposition, was forced to resort to drastic measures to establish Christianity. He had to curse the fertile lands of the Druids so that they became dreary bogs, to curse their rivers so that they contained no fish; to curse their very pots and kettles, so that no amount of fire could make them boil; and, finally, to place a ban on the Druids themselves, so that the earth opened and swallowed them up.

The good saint perhaps worked more effectively on less miraculous lines. In the main he went about among the petty tribes and became good friends with the chieftains. He dealt gently with the old pagan belief and gradually drew the chieftains toward Christianity. The followers came with the chief.

DIES ABOUT A. D. 465.

At a fine old age St. Patrick quit this world one seventeenth day of March in the year of which is generally given as 465.

As the birthplace of St. Patrick is disputed, so is his burial place. The general evidence indicates that he was interred at Downpatrick and that the remains of St. Columb and St. Bridget were laid beside him.

THE SNAKE LEGEND.

Although extremely vague in regard to facts the life of St. Patrick is rich in legends. One might as well doubt Santa Claus as to look with scepticism on the marvelous feat of driving reptiles out of the Emerald Isle. That is unquestionably the most popular miracle the saint ever performed. As long as serpents exist and continue to shiver at the thought of Ireland—it is accepted by all authority that there are no snakes on the Emerald Isle—the fame of St. Patrick will endure forever. The soil of Ireland is almostous to creeping things, and those who know say that they die instantly when they touch the ground.

How St. Patrick drove all snakes out of Ireland is told in many stories, both serious and humorous. The one that has the best sanction is that the good saint constructed a wondrous drum that when struck made every reptile in the land squirm and turn over when he heard it, for up to the time of St. Patrick's drum Ireland was infested with snakes beyond belief. At the second roll of the drum the doomed serpents wriggled out of their hiding places and began an unwilling pilgrimage for the ocean. It is said that the good saint became [illegible] years an exceedingly

[illegible] Frequently, hardening exposing nut trees are [illegible] people [illegible] out of the ground in early Spring too far from a parent tree to assume for [illegible] having born the hairy kernel on its wings. Similarly, exterminate the squirrels in any section of woods and the tree planting practically ceases. It is a well-known fact that seeds of plants frequently become lodged in the fure of wild animals only to be shaken off and to take root at some point far distant. But the planter—squirrel, I think, I discovered myself.

"It is a wonderful thing when you come to consider what part the tiny, bushy tailed animals may have played in the history of

place [illegible] Glendo[illegible] but authorities are now fairly well agreed that it was at Old Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton, Scotland.

The second Latin piece assigned to the saint are the "Epistles to Coroticus." These have been preserved for us in manuscripts of the tenth or eleventh century. In style and language they closely resemble the "Confession," whole phrases being actually identical in both. Coroticus, a semi-Christian King of Dumbarton, (All Claude,) along with some Scots, i. e., Irish and Southern Picts who had fallen away from Christianity, raided the eastern shores of Ireland and carried off several of St. Patrick's converts, "leaving the white garments of the neophytes stained with blood, and hurrying into captivity numbers upon whose foreheads the holy oil of confirmation was still glistening."

The first letter asked Coroticus to restore the captives, and when this request was refused, the second was sent, excommunicating the King and all his abettors and abettors, calling upon all Christians neither to eat nor drink in their company until they had made explation for their great crimes.

St. Patrick's beautiful hymn, the "Deer's Cry" is of special interest as being the oldest composition extant in the Gaelic language. It is written in a very ancient dialect, and was composed, as the hymn itself shows, when Ireland was largely pagan. In the Liber Hymnorum, a manuscript of the eleventh century, in which it is preserved, it is introduced by a short preface, also in Gaelic. The saint is there said to have made it when on [illegible] way to visit King Laoghaire (Leary) [illegible] (Tara,) and the assassins who [illegible] set in ambush to slay him and companions mistook the chanting [illegible] "lorica" for the [illegible] of passing and so allowed them to escape.

Notwithstanding the glowing [illegible]

[illegible] the manager of an up-town hotel celebrated for its [illegible] there will be more fashionable weddings in the leading New York hotels after next Easter than there were last year. There were so numerous that would go [illegible] from some city pulpits declaring the hotel was the only fit and appropriate place for the solemnity of a wedding ceremony.

"The change coming about, in my opinion, is due to a habit many well-to-do families have of taking suburban houses a short distance from New York for at least eight months of the year, and living in apartments in the heart of city life during the social season.

"A fashionable girl who can afford something better naturally dislikes a pretty country wedding. A large wedding in cramped town apartments is out of the question. To drive first to church and then to a hotel involves confusion and unnecessary expense, some persons think, when there can be a brilliant bridal ceremony in the hotel drawing room and a wedding breakfast ready in an adjoining room directly after the congratulations are over.

"The hotel wedding is particularly in favor with out-of-town guests who have a number of friends in New York and desire their presence at the ceremony. Their friends at home are glad of a chance to make a trip to the metropolis and have a good time. Of course, if there are home ties, it is a different matter, but a large proportion of marriages in this city every year are between a man and a woman whose home associations are far, very or perhaps broken forever. Such persons, if they have any friends in New York, no longer go to a rector entirely unknown to them, and have the housemaid and some other member of the household act as witnesses. They go to a fashionable hotel, invite all the nice people they know, and make a joyous occasion of it.

"Naturally the hotel wedding cannot all together take the place of the expensive and ultra-fashionable church ceremony, with its special choir, flower-covered altar, imposing bridal procession, bridesmaids, train bearers, and other time-honored accessories. Society will never let that go. But among persons who like to do the swell thing within a reasonable limit of expenditure, the hotel wedding has got a firm foothold in New York, and is growing in favor."

H GYMNASIUM.

like a seal or a sea lion in the act of lifting his head to look abroad. While the child rests the teacher gives gentle massage to the muscles of the back.

When this patient is tired, the phlegmatic one is put through a variety of odd motions as she sits on a padded bench, and is [illegible] on the parallel bars, while she [illegible] cutas, under protest, evolutions specially intended to strengthen the muscles of the abdominal region. All the while the brisk little teacher works harder than her pupils, commanding, entreating, occasionally taunting with mild badinage, encouraging whenever her quick eye detects the necessity for encouragement.

This community is so full of children [illegible]

whether the National Legislature for this year will be held at Baltimore, Md., upon the Patapsco river course, or at Worcester, Mass., on Lake Quinsigamond, that this is a secondary matter, and the racing clubs and oarsmen appear to care little so long as the last bit of argument on the turn question is disposed of.

Frederick H. Fortmeyer, Secretary of the National Association and a member of the Executive Committee, yesterday afternoon said that years of experience seemed to prove conclusively that the only true and full competitive basis for a National championship race was over a straight-away course. "The turn allows the element of chance to become the main factor of the contest. I could recite scores of instances in which boats that were four lengths behind at the turning stake have caught the luck at the turn and come home in advance of the others. There is a knack on a trick, if you prefer to so call it, in whipping a shell around a turning buoy in a race. I have known oarsmen to practice the trick of the turn until they had it down to perfection. Sometimes it

[illegible] just been announced, is about to establish a special department of physical and corrective education with a member of the Faculty at its head. The importance of just such gymnastics as will form part of the Columbia course has of late years been fully recognized. Wise physicians are more and more inclined to substitute special exercises for medicines and the old-time plasters, castes and iron harnesses and braces. Some even approach the cure of mental disease by way of corrective gymnastics. Curvature of the spine is one of the commoner defects cured by such treatment. This defect is often accompanied with the disease of the foot called flatfoot. The two are cured together by patient and long continued treatment. Sometimes daily lessons for nine months of the year and for several years in succession are necessary to a cure. Occasionally an improvement is noticed in the first week of treatment.

Pigeon-breasted, round-shouldered, knock-kneed children come for treatment to the health gymnasium, and in the course of a year or two develop into active muscular well-formed little creatures enjoying as fine what they first took as medicine. Even children with partial paralysis are greatly helped by proper exercise. The numbed member slowly regains power, the atrophied muscles grow and strengthen, the lost symmetry is restored. With the restoration of health and symmetry, and the newly acquired art of proper walking, standing, and breathing come ease and grace, and from the reaction of the physical upon the mental, confidence, repose and healthful merriment.

The teacher finds the most marked improvements in patients between the ages of five and thirteen. She modestly declines to say at what age a case may be hopeless, because she has not attempted the cure of many adults. A woman on the verge of thirty [illegible] under her care, benefitting perhaps if she were five years older the cure would be more difficult, possibly. If she were ten years older it would be impossible. She is busy for nine months of the year, and says that she could [illegible] people all day, if she chose to neglect her own need of rest.

[illegible] the National Committee [illegible] amendment when the bill comes up in the Senate.

The most important change in the bill since last week is the insertion of a provision for the payment of the election inspectors for their extra work as primary election inspectors at the rate of $4 a day. Formerly no provision was made for their payment. Another change [illegible] Patrick's name on primary elections is to be one [illegible] M. instead of S. [illegible]

[illegible] in a part by giving [illegible] the voting power of delegates to a convention according to the party vote for Governor. It is not likely that any changes whatever will be made in the bill hereafter, and this will permit its passage by both houses next week.

MAHER KNOCKED DOWN, BUT WINS.

He Won Most with Steve O'Donnell Stopped in the Second Round.

PHILADELPHIA, March 16.—Despite the fact that Peter Maher had already defeated Steve O'Donnell, there was a good house at the Arena to-night. It was Peter's birthday, and he celebrated it by adding another victory to his collection. O'Donnell started off by knocking Maher down and Peter stayed on the floor as long as he dared. Steve did not know how to take advantage of the opportunity, and after the middle of the first round the fight was Maher's. In the second round Steve was knocked down three times and Referee Schlicher stopped the bout.

Following his usual custom, Maher started for O'Donnell's corner as soon as the gong sounded and essayed a left-handed lead, which O'Donnell ducked. Before the spectators really realized what had occurred Maher was on the floor, the result of a short right-arm jolt. Peter was visibly shaken up, and took his time in getting up. Instead of following up his advantage, O'Donnell contented himself with a little fancy work at long range. This gave an opportunity to Maher to get himself together. He gradually closed in on O'Donnell, and, landing with his left lightly on the wind, got in a short right-armed swing on the side of O'Donnell's head. Down went O'Donnell, with Maher standing over him ready to administer the quietus. The referee sent Maher to the middle of the ring, and O'Donnell got up. Maher immediately rushed him, but referee for distance was badly away and a clinch followed. Just before the breakaway Peter dropped his right arm and again O'Donnell went down with a punch on the side of the head. Cries of "Foul" came from O'Donnell's corner, but no heed was paid to them. At this point the crowd Maher appeared to be just as fast from his own evolutions as was O'Donnell.

[illegible] detectives and friends of O'Donnell [illegible] corner. There was a clinch. While O'Donnell's right arm was safely pinioned to Maher's side, he latter, with that short right-handed swing [illegible] the head [illegible] in the first round. [illegible] again and down he went.

It was thought that he would stay down for good, but he managed to regain his feet before the expiration of the time limit and surprised spectators by the amount of vitality he showed. Maher rushed him, but he cleverly ducked, slid sideways, [illegible] a couple of stiff punches on the body. Maher again pushed O'Donnell into the ropes and Steve was at a disadvantage. [illegible] was practically spent, but at that Maher did not have enough strength to [illegible] him out. He did however land with his right lightly, and O'Donnell went down. He was not knocked out and did not appear to be any more depressed than he was at the end of the first round, but referee Schlicher thought that he had gone far enough and put a stop to further hostilities. Peter was declared the winner.

Sports on the Ice.

There was a big programme of novel and very interesting features at the Lenox Avenue Ice Rink last night. The rink was crowded of sports on [illegible] and a most enthusiastic throng of spectators. [illegible] Summary:

[illegible] Race—Won by [illegible] second. Time [illegible] seconds.

[illegible] Race—Won by Hugo Palmer; Harry [illegible] second. Time [illegible] seconds.

[illegible] Race—Won by Arthur [illegible] second. Time [illegible] seconds.

[illegible] Record of 1 Mile for [illegible] Time [illegible] seconds.

[illegible] Race—Won by Ben Nevin; second, A. R. Fewell; third, Peter J. Lerner. Time [illegible] seconds.

[illegible] Race—Won by [illegible] second, Harry M. Lamphier; third [illegible]

[illegible] Race—Won by [illegible] second, Frederick [illegible]

[illegible] Race—Won by [illegible] second, Harry M. Lamphier; third [illegible]

[illegible] Race—Won by [illegible] second, [illegible]; third, [illegible]

[illegible] between the [illegible] and [illegible] second. The match ended [illegible] in the second [illegible] Letter

[illegible] bridge of Niagara Falls, Niagara-on-the-Lake [illegible] on next Saturday, March [illegible] and [illegible] for round trip.

[illegible] at $3.95

Furnishings for Boys.

Stiff Bosom and Negligee Shirts, of percale, madras or cheviot, conventional or coat model with attached or detached cuffs; 12 to 14 inch neck band.

Value $1.25 Special at 85c

"Star" and "K. & E." Blouses of madras or cheviot, with neck band or Byron collar; sizes 6 to 16 years.

Value $1.25 Special at 95c

Silk Scarfs in four-in-hand, Windsor, Club and bow shapes.

Value 25c Special at 19c

[illegible] Informed and believes was a lease of the same property (covered by the bill of sale) but for what period of time or under what conditions she does not know." She also asserted that prior to Jan. 1, 1899, Mr. Daly caused his life to be insured for $20,000 and had the policy assigned to her and that he gave to her two promissory notes, one dated Feb. 2, 1895, for $6,000 and the other dated March 1, 1895, for $9,000.

The answer filed by Edward H. Daly set forth that the New York Life Insurance Company paid to Miss Rehan $10,299.80, and that the executors required Miss Rehan to credit them with that amount.

The answer also set forth that in case the settlement agreement is refused, there will be due to the estate $3,500.18, which Mr. Daly paid out for Miss Rehan prior to his death and for which amount they demand judgment should the Court decide to reform the settlement agreement.

The trial was adjourned until Monday.

ENDS HIS LIFE BY POISON.

Thomas Grifin, 22 years of age, committed suicide last night by taking carbolic acid in the cellar of a boarding house at 180 Fi[illegible]

St. Patrick's Day 1555 fell on Tuesday

THE ROMAN CALENDAR tells the day of the week in addition to the day of month and year and can correctly date from 1-A. D. to the end of time. Issue in the last period. Send the dinner or card to THE PERPETUAL CALENDAR CO. P. O. Box 289, N. Y. City.

GROSS Examining Optician Estab. 1839. Fee $1. 20 East 23d Street

street, [illegible] Mr. Denis Media, Mrs. Media found [illegible] dying [illegible] out of work [illegible] poor health.

QUEEN ALEXANDRA SAILS.

London, March [illegible] Queen Alexandra [illegible]

EST

Allc

POROUS

A universal remedy for pains in [illegible] women. They give [illegible] a pain [illegible] should b

Rheu

Colds,

Weak

Weak

Lum

Sci

&C.

Allcock's [illegible] are a [illegible] others.

Much Doubt as to the Exact Birthplace of Erin's Famous Patron Saint, Four Countries Claiming the Honor — Is Stolen by Pirates When a Youth and Sold in Ireland—Becomes a Priest, Is Sent Back to the Emerald Isle, Converts the Chieftains, Rules the People, Drives Out the Snakes, Conquers a Monster, Performs Miracles and Dies at a Ripe Old Age Somewhere Around March 17, 465—Nowhere More Popular Than in America.

Although the fact is not generally appreciated by those other than Celts, the commemoration of St. Patrick's Day is not a sectarian celebration but a pure and simple national holiday, at least as far as New York city is concerned. It would be as reasonable to assert that George Washington's Birthday is an Episcopalian holiday as to restrict St. Patrick's Day to the Catholic Irishmen. St. Patrick was a missionary of the Roman Catholic Church it is true, but, more than that, he was a national hero, a prominent figure in early Irish history, whose achievements were not the less great because at present they have been somewhat undone by British domination.

St. Patrick stands to Ireland much as Solon stood to the Athenians and Lycurgus to the Spartans. But he occupies an even more important position. He was more than a lawgiver. He was an educator and, above all, the builder of Ireland as a nation. Previous to his work Ireland had maintained an insecure confederation of provinces, that were themselves broken up into petty tribes and clans. St. Patrick was the means of bringing these closer together for mutual protection and welfare. Ever a diplomat, St. Patrick never attempted radical changes. His achievements consequently do not seem startling at first sight. But the transformation that he wrought in Ireland was none the less complete. By modification of old institutions the politic saint brought about better conditions without the Irish chiefs having an inkling that they were being reformed.

All accounts credit St. Patrick with being an unassuming, unostentatious man who sought nothing but the welfare of the Irish people, chiefs and peasantry. He is said to have had a ready wit and the genius of good fellowship. He was not an Irishman by birth, but one by nature.

HISTORY OF ST. PATRICK OBSCURE.

Concerning the history of Ireland's patron saint there is much obscurity. Facts relative to his early life, as should be the case in the chronicles of saints and heroes, are extremely shadowy and confused, although they are numerous. Some one with an affection for dates and an indifference for certainty has settled that the saint was born somewhere about A. D. 372. Seven cities claimed to be the birthplace of Homer; St. Patrick falls somewhat behind that record, but does very creditably. Four countries, Scotland, England, France and Wales each assert that Ireland's saint was her son. Ireland herself seems to be the only land with a vestige of a claim that does not attempt to appropriate St. Patrick. Irishmen, however, are agreed that the enemy of reptiles, when once he had become ac-

Patrick set out for Ireland in about 405 A. D. to preach the Gospel to the then heathen inhabitants of the Emerald Isle. The principal enemies to the introduction of the Christian faith into Ireland, St Patrick found, were the Druids. Of a much more ancient faith, this hierarchy was naturally extremely opposed to anything like an innovation. Consequently they fought St. Patrick bitterly. Being mighty magicians, they would have been irresistible opponents for any one less endowed with miraculous and saintly power than St. Patrick.

CONQUERS IRELAND.

In addition to these occult powers, the saint, although a simple and somewhat unlettered man, was a discreet diplomat as well as an enthusiastic missionary. The Druids were formidable opponents. The belief in their power was ancient and deep-rooted. Their disposition was to do harm rather than good; so they were greatly feared by the people. St. Patrick, in spite of his mild disposition, was forced to resort to drastic measures to establish Christianity. He had to curse the fertile lands of the Druids so that they became dreary bogs; to curse their rivers, so that they contained no fish; to curse their very pots and kettles, so that no amount of fire could make them boil; and, finally, to place a ban on the Druids themselves, so that the earth opened and swallowed them up.

The good saint perhaps worked more effectively on less miraculous lines. In the main he went about among the petty tribes and became good friends with the chieftains. He dealt gently with the old pagan belief and gradually drew the chieftains toward Christianity. The followers came with the chief

DIED ABOUT A. D. 465.

At a fine old age St. Patrick quit this world one seventeenth day of March the year of which is generally given as 465.

As the birthplace of St. Patrick is disputed, so is his burial place. The general evidence indicates that he was interred at Downpatrick and that the remains of St. Columb and St. Bridget were laid beside him.

THE SNAKE LEGEND.

Although extremely vague in regard to facts, the life of St. Patrick is rich in legends. One might as well doubt Santa Claus as to look with scepticism on his miraculous feat of driving reptiles out of the Emerald Isle. That is unquestionably the most popular miracle the saint ever performed. As long as serpents exist and continue to shiver at the thought of Ireland—it is accepted by all authority that there are no snakes on the Emerald Isle—the fame of St. Patrick will endure forever. The soil of Ireland is obnoxious to creeping things, and those who know say that they die instantly when they touch the ground.

How St. Patrick drove all snakes out of Ireland is told in many stories, both serious and humorous. The one that has the best sanction is that the good saint constructed a wondrous drum that when struck made every reptile in the land squirm and turn over when he heard it; for up to the time of St. Patrick's drum Ireland was infested with snakes beyond belief. At the second roll of the drum the doomed serpents wriggled out of their hiding places and began an unwilling pilgrimage for the ocean. It is said that the good saint became so enthusiastic and beat so zealously